

Proceedings

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF
THE SOCIALIST PARTY



HELD AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
MAY 15 to 21, 1910

NATIONAL CONGRESS
OF THE
SOCIALIST PARTY

HELD IN MASONIC TEMPLE

CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 15 TO 21, 1910

Stenographic Report by

WILSON E. McDERMUT

Member of S. & T. A. No. 12,755

CHICAGO

PUBLISHED BY

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

J. MAHLON BARNES, National Secretary

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, 180 Washington Street
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

First National Congress of the Socialist Party of the United States

BOUND Dec 31 1940



Acknowledgment

Acknowledgment is made of services rendered by Comrades George Roewer, Jr., Secretary of the Congress; Assistants Robert B. Ringler and Frank Hubschmitt; also to Comrades John C. Chase and John M. Work, Assistants in the National Office, in editing and preparing this report.

J. MAHLON BARNES,
National Secretary.



H. G. ADAIR, 164 LAKE ST., CHICAGO

Held at Chicago, Illinois, Beginning Sunday, May 15, 1910,
and Ending Saturday, May 21, 1910

FIRST DAY'S SESSION.

The first National Congress of the Socialist Party of the United States convened at the Drill Hall in the Masonic Temple, Chicago, Illinois, Sunday, May 15, 1910, and was called to order at 11 A. M. by National Secretary J. Mahlon Barnes, in the following words:

"Comrades of the Congress: It becomes my duty to report the action taken by the National Committee in the matter of choosing a date and place for the holding of the National Party Congress. By vote closing February 17, 1910, the following result was declared: Chicago has been chosen as the city and May 15 was selected as the date for the opening of the Congress. In accordance with the above record and by authority of the national constitution, the first Congress of the Socialist Party of America is hereby called to order. The constitution further provides that the National Secretary shall call the roll to ascertain the number of uncontested delegates, and they shall permanently organize the Congress. The roll of delegates will now be called."

The roll was then called, showing the following delegates in attendance:

ALABAMA—C. G. Hutchisson.
ARIZONA—Jos. D. Cannon.

CALIFORNIA—W. Carpenter, J. B. Osborne, J. Stitt Wilson, Ernest Unterman, John H. Wilde.

COLORADO—W. P. Collins, Mila Tupper Maynard.

CONNECTICUT—Ella Reeve Bloor, Jasper McLevy.

FLORIDA—C. C. Allen.

IDAHO—T. J. Coonrod.

ILLINOIS—G. T. Fraenckel, Robert Giese, Adolph Germer, A. M. Lewis, T. J. Morgan, A. W. Nelson, G. A. Peterson, A. M. Simons.

INDIANA—James Oneal, S. M. Reynolds.

IOWA—John M. Work, J. J. Jacobsen.

KANSAS—George D. Brewer, Caroline A. Lowe, Kate Richards O'Hare.

KENTUCKY—Walter Lanfersiek.

LOUISIANA—J. W. Barnes.

MAINE—Grace V. Silver.

MASSACHUSETTS—James A. DeBell, James F. Carey, Harriet D'Orsay, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr.

MICHIGAN—Henry Kummerfeld, J. Hoogerhyde.

MINNESOTA—Morris Kaplan, Leo Laukki, J. E. Nash.

MISSOURI—E. T. Behrens, W. L. Garver, W. W. McAllister.

MONTANA—Geo. W. McDermott.

NEBRASKA—Clyde J. Wright.

474136

NATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS

NEVADA—W. H. Burton.
NEW HAMPSHIRE—John P. Burke.

NEW JERSEY—Max Fackert, Geo. H. Goebel, Frank Hubschmitt, W. B. Killingbeck.

NEW YORK—Jos. Wanhope, Morris Hillquit, Algernon Lee, W. W. Passage, C. L. Furman, H. Schefer, Park Dills, Gustave Strebel, Frank Cassidy.

NORTH DAKOTA—Arthur Bassett.

OHIO—E. E. Adel, W. H. Miller, E. L. Schnaitt, Marguerite Prevey, Jno. G. Willert, L. A. Zitt.

OKLAHOMA—Oscar Ameringer, Winnie E. Branstetter, J. T. Cumbie, G. W. Davis.

OREGON—E. L. Cannon, Tom J. Lewis.

PENNSYLVANIA—Thomas F. Kennedy, Robert B. Ringler, Wm. Adams.

RHODE ISLAND—Fred Hurst.

SOUTH DAKOTA—E. Francis Atwood.

TENNESSEE—T. H. Haines.

TEXAS—W. J. Bell, W. W. Buchanan, P. G. Zimmerman.

UTAH—W. Thurston Brown.

WASHINGTON—Mrs. E. D. Cory, W. H. Waynick.

WEST VIRGINIA—Harold W. Houston.

WISCONSIN—Victor L. Berger, W. R. Gaylord, E. H. Thomas, Carl D. Thompson.

WYOMING—W. L. O'Neil, John Heckala.

DELAWARE—J. Frank Smith.

GEORGIA—Paul Hochscheid.

MISSISSIPPI—S. W. Rose.

NORTH CAROLINA—Rufus J. Morton.

VIRGINIA—E. B. Slatton.
DELEGATES FOREIGN-SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

BOHEMIAN—Jos. Novak, Steve Skala.

FINNISH—Toivo Hiltunen.

ITALIAN—James C. Pellegrine, Rokos Pekos.

JEWISH AGI. BUREAU—Meyer London, Barnett Wolff.

LETTISH—John Klawia.

POLISH SECTION—I. Klawier, J. Kochanowicz.

SCANDINAVIAN—S. J. Christensen, N. F. Holm.

SOUTH. SLAVS—Dimitri Economoff.

SEC. BARNES, following the roll call, said: I will read an extract from the minutes of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party held yesterday: "Communications from J. Holler, member of the State Executive Committee of California, and Locals Los Angeles and San Francisco, protesting the election of the reported delegates of California to the Congress as irregular; also a letter upon the same subject from Comrade Meriam, State Secretary. Motion, That Comrade Barnes, when reading roll of delegates, explain the situation in California; and in view of the fact that there are no contesting delegates, that the National Executive Committee advises the seating of the delegates. Adopted."

Since the above action was taken, Comrade Holler has made representation to me, which I think should at this time become the property of the Congress, as follows: "That immediately following the election of the delegates by the State Executive Committee, five members, the number required by the constitution, signed a call to initiate a referendum of the State Central Committee upon said act. That now there are thirteen signers for the same purpose. He holds, as does also the present State Secretary, that such initiative acts as a stay and nullifies any action taken by the State Executive Committee until passed upon by the State Central Committee." He desires to present additional evidence which did not appear before the National Executive Committee. He also asks that the matter be referred to a committee on contested seats.

What is the pleasure of the Congress? I will hear a motion to act upon the roll in its entirety, or to pass upon the roll, excepting the California delegates.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I move you that all the delegates whose names were read, except those of the delegates from California, now be declared seated. I will make another motion following that.

Motion seconded.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): That includes, of course, all those who may have been absent when the roll call was made?

DEL. GOEBEL: Yes.

SEC. BARNES: That is understood, I believe.

MORNING SESSION, MAY 15, 1910

The motion was put and carried.

DEL. GOEBEL: Now I want to make a motion in just a few words.

SEC. BARNES: The next order of business is the election of permanent officers.

DEL. GOEBEL: But this is not finished. We have not done anything about the delegates from California.

SEC. BARNES: We are now a Congress, and we must proceed with the election of a regular chairman. That is according to the rules.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Cal.): The Hungarian Socialist Society has sent a delegation. They did not have time to notify the National Secretary. I move that they be seated, with voice, but no vote. (Seconded.)

SEC. BARNES: Let me suggest that that go over till we elect a permanent chairman.

National Secretary Barnes called for nominations for permanent chairman for the day, and the following delegates were nominated: Gaylord, of Wisconsin; Hillquit, of New York; T. J. Lewis, of Oregon; Untermann, of California. Delegates Untermann and Gaylord declined, and Delegate Hillquit was elected and called to preside.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): I have been requested by Carpenters' Union 1784, of Chicago, to present this congress with a gavel, which, through you, I now present to the congress.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Fraenckel, in behalf of this congress I wish to extend the thanks of the congress to the Carpenters' Union of Chicago, and promise you to wield the gavel with discretion, and probably with some force if necessary. Now we are ready to proceed with the business of the Congress, and in order to set a good example I will make no opening speech. I merely want to remind you, comrades, that this is not a convention, but a conference; that we are charged here primarily with the duty of evolving proper working methods for the Socialist Party. In an ordinary convention the demonstration which is implied in a large gathering of representatives of a political party is in itself a factor. In this particular case we are not here for demonstration. We are here as a deliberative body, and I believe that if the comrades will bear that in mind all through we will be able to accom-

plish the task and fulfill the trust imposed upon us by our constituents. As a very few of the rules which may be quite helpful, I would suggest, first of all, that we have perfect quiet and order at all times, and that the audience and guests of the congress help us as much as the delegates. Nothing is better conducive to an orderly, deliberative proceeding than absolute quiet and calm in the assembly. I will also suggest to the delegates that they ought to try to be brief and to the point.

Now, I know from personal experience that that is a hard task for us, probably half or three-quarters of whom are professional speakers. At the same time it is well to bear in mind that in this particular case eloquence should be absolutely barred. Eloquence is absolutely out of place here. (Applause.) There are occasions where it is very helpful, but we usually do not indulge in flights of oratory when we discuss our business or family affairs, when we mean business, and I will ask you to bear in mind that we are assembled here strictly for business and not for the purpose of hearing each other talk. The National Executive Committee, under the constitution, has adopted a certain rule of procedure which we will read to you in a moment and have you pass upon. Before doing that, however, I will call for the election of a temporary Secretary, for we can do no business without keeping a record. Nominations for temporary Secretary are now in order.

The following nominations for temporary Secretary were made: W. R. Gaylord, Wisconsin; Geo. E. Roewer, Jr., Massachusetts; W. J. Bell, Texas; M. Prevey, Ohio; E. H. Thomas, Wisconsin. All the nominees except Delegate Roewer declined, and he was elected Secretary by acclamation.

DORA B. MONTEFIORE.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding to the next business, comrades, I wish to inform you that we have the pleasure here of the presence of a member of the Executive Council of the Social Democratic Federation of England, one of the most active, devoted members and speakers of the Party, Comrade Dora F. Montefiore. In behalf and in the name of the Congress, I extend the welcome of the Socialist Party of the United States

NATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS

to this representative of the Social Democratic Party of England, and I suggest a motion to grant her the privileges of a fraternal delegate to the congress.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I move that she be given a seat with a voice in the deliberations of this Congress.

The motion was seconded by Delegate Marguerite Prevey and was carried, and Mrs. Montefiore was received with enthusiasm and spoke as follows:

ADDRESS BY ENGLISH DELEGATE.

MRS. MONTEFIORE: Comrade Chairman and Comrades, I have first of all to thank you for the honor you have done me in giving me a seat on the floor of this most interesting conference. Then I have to give you the greetings of the comrades of Great Britain. I know they must be envying me the privilege that I have of being present at this meeting when you are going to discuss the business of the Party and the best methods of furthering your propaganda. Your chairman has told you that I am a member of the London Executive Council of the Social Democratic Party. I did not stand last April for re-election, but I have been serving for two years, and therefore it is of great interest to me to be present and to hear your deliberation and to know what decisions you may come to for the purpose of furthering the Party interests. Comrades, I am not going to take up your time, but I may perhaps say that I feel like all of us feel when traveling in other countries and coming in contact with comrades from other countries. Though I have been only a fortnight in your great country, I know the stupendous work which you devoted comrades have before you. I have no doubt when you travel through Great Britain the same feeling comes to you when you see how a small band of Socialists is able to contend with the terrible conditions of capitalism and the apparently overwhelming work they have to carry on. But, comrades, it is when we go from country to country that we feel the whole force of the great international movement, the great pressure of international forces that links us together and gives us that overwhelming force which will in the end conquer and break up capitalism and will give the world to the workers. I

thank you, comrades, for having listened to my few words. (Applause.)

TELEGRAMS.

The following telegrams were read: "Greetings to the delegates assembled, and hearty good wishes for the most fruitful deliberations of the working class congress. Eugene V. Debs." (Applause.)

"International Congress of the Socialist Party.—Comrades: We, the protesting members of Local St. Louis, reaffirm our allegiance to the Socialist Party, and trust great good will result for the cause of Socialism. B. M. Haskins, C. C. Wederman, S. Libisou." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: There is another telegram, as follows:

"Chairman Socialist Congress: Refuse Osborne seat. Repudiated by state referendum. A. B. Smith."

If there is no objection this telegram will be turned over to the committee on contested seats when elected.

The Secretary will now please read the rules of procedure, and unless we hear objection to the separate paragraphs as read they will be declared adopted.

Secretary Roewer then read the following rules:

RULES OF PROCEDURE.

"1. The Congress shall be opened by the National Secretary, and the latter shall immediately upon the opening call the roll of delegates. Delegates whose seats are not contested shall constitute the Congress and shall proceed to the transaction of business.

"2. A chairman shall be elected for the first day of the Congress, and at the beginning of each subsequent day of the sessions of the Congress a new chairman shall be elected for such day.

"3. A permanent Secretary and two assistants, who need not be delegates, shall be elected for the entire Congress.

"4. The Secretary may appoint one or more reading clerks to assist him.

"5. A Sergeant-at-Arms, who need not be a delegate, shall be appointed by the Chairman at the first day's session, to act throughout the entire congress.

"6. The Sergeant-at-Arms shall appoint five messengers, who shall act under his direction.

"7. Four tellers and two judges to

MORNING SESSION, MAY 15, 1910

count all ballots shall be appointed for the entire congress.

"8. The following committees shall be elected:

"(a) A committee on Contested Seats, if there should be any contests, to consist of five members. (b) A committee on Resolutions, to consist of five members. (c) A committee on Constitution, to consist of five members."

CALIFORNIA CASE.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Cal.): Comrade Chairman, I think we can save this Congress the trouble of appointing a committee to investigate any contests. I think Comrade Barnes will bear me out in saying that there are not sufficient contests to warrant such a committee, and will also bear me out in the statement that the protest from California is so specious that every one who knows the comrades who constitute the delegation from California and who knows the situation out there are convinced that the unknown comrades who make this protest do so for factional reasons and because they want to prevent the State of California from having any representation in this Congress. They have not appointed any delegates and they do not intend to appoint any delegates to this Congress. Therefore, I move that this protest be ruled out and that the delegates be seated without any further proceedings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Untermann, not having been so far seated, I cannot entertain the motion. Does any comrade who has been seated desire to make a motion?

DEL. UNTERMANN: I hope there will be comrades on this floor just enough to overlook that technicality.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): As a matter of justice to Comrade Untermann as one of the delegates from California, and as a matter of justice to the California delegates who are present, I move that this matter be taken up and that a committee be appointed, because it would look a good deal fairer to the comrades if such a committee was appointed and reported.

DEL. WILDE (Cal.): As one of the delegates, I second the motion that was made by the comrade. The comrades in California only want justice. If they are not entitled to a seat on the floor they do not want it.

DEL. M'ALLISTER (Mo.): I move to adopt the rule to elect a Committee on Contested Seats.

The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any more discussion on this section of the rules?

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): As yet we have no rules except those we have adopted. Am I right?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. GOEBEL: All right. Then any order of business in the absence of further rules provided by the Congress would be in order. Some of us have seen some petty politics alluded to, and it is time right here and now to say in this Congress that we don't stand for it. We have seen it in our own states in some cases. I am willing to hear the other side and willing to have a Committee on Contested Seats and have a hearing, but I am not willing in the meanwhile that comrades who come clear from California and are known almost as well as any one in this movement should sit here and rest under charges such as these. I move that the delegates who claim to represent California be seated with voice, but no vote, until such time as the Committee on Contested Seats shall report to the congress.

Motion seconded.

DEL. WILLERT (Ohio): I believe that the action that was previously taken was that the matter of seating the delegates from California should be left over until a Committee on Contested Seats should be elected and report.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

DEL. WILLERT: Then this would be out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will not, Comrade Willert. We have since organized and elected a permanent chairman, and we are now technically a different body from the body that passed the other motion.

DEL. WILLERT: I want to say that you could get along much faster if you would go along in the way you did.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I want to say this. We can get along faster, but we can't get along with as much justice. It is better to be slower with justice than faster without justice. The effect of passing this order will be that when

it comes to nominating comrades for the different committees, perhaps by that time very likely the Credentials Committee will not have reported and it means that the delegates from California do not figure in the active make-up of this congress. It means that they cannot be nominated on any committees. It means that the comrades in California who want simply to sling mud will have accomplished their purpose in barring them out from all the practical work of this congress. I for one do not stand for it, and I am going to vote against it.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I understand that there is no contesting delegation here. I know of no sufficient reason, therefore, even for referring the matter to a contesting committee, except to put the matter on record in proper form. This congress has the power, I will suggest to Comrade Willett, to take any one from the streets and give him a right to a voice in the congress if he is a member of the party. We certainly have a right to take those comrades that come clear from California with credentials and give them seats in the congress.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): I would like to have Comrade Goebel's motion carried in order to give us at least a voice at this moment and a voice when we are ready to speak again.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I believe this protest from California has come in such a form as to limit the action of the National Executive Committee who presented it here. I would suggest that it follow the ordinary course and that it go to a committee. The prominence of the comrades who are questioned by that protest should suggest modesty rather than eagerness to pass over the formalities. I rise to make that suggestion to the delegates, that there is no emergency that should override the due course of a legislative body. These prominent members from California, if they have a right to a seat here, will have it. Privileges should not be granted. Place us all on a level. I am opposed to the motion. I am in favor of it going to a committee and ascertaining whether these contestant comrades in California have any rights or not, and that these delegates from California shall abide by that decision and settle the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I call the attention of the comrades to the fact that

we have just passed a motion to refer it to a committee. The question before you is not whether the standing of the California delegates shall be referred for investigation and report to a committee, but whether the delegates should have a voice in this congress in the meanwhile.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Cal.): I think it should be heard here right now. I think it is not a question of whether I am modest or whether I act from egotism. I believe that the comrade who has just made that remark is one of the very petty politicians of this movement.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): That is a slander that we will not stand for.

DEL. UNTERMANN: I rise to a question of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman wants to make a statement, if you will yield for a moment, Comrade Untermann. I will say now, comrades, at the very outset, at the very beginning, that we shall not at any time, no matter under what provocation, permit the proceedings of this Congress to degenerate into personal quarrels. (Applause.)

DEL. UNTERMANN: You have permitted it by permitting that comrade to call me an egotist.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have not. Comrade, you can speak to the subject, and you can do it very well, if you want to; there is no doubt about that.

DEL. UNTERMANN: I wish to be heard.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will.

DEL. UNTERMANN: I want a voice in this Congress, and it would seem natural that I should not wait until—

A DELEGATE: A point of order. The delegate has not been seated, and he is out of order in addressing this body now.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade (Untermann) is now not recognized as a delegate strictly, but it is a question of his standing, and I believe it is customary in all Socialist gatherings to allow the party under charges a word in his defense. Comrade Untermann, you will continue.

DEL. UNTERMANN: I have no wish at all to allow this to degenerate into a personal quarrel, but I object to being personally attacked without raising my voice here where I have

been attacked. The fact is that these men have not nominated any delegates and did not intend to nominate any delegates, and the sole purpose of their action is to prevent the active party in California from having any representation in this Congress. I do not object to any investigation, but I want a voice in this Congress now.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): Mr. Chairman, I think if you had allowed the regular course of procedure to continue the whole matter would probably have been solved by this time. I think it is decidedly unfair, to put myself in the place of Brother Wilson or Comrade Untermann, or any of the other comrades. The question is whether you ought to give Comrade Untermann the same privilege of a voice without a vote while the question of his seat is under decision. Let us be fair about it. I understand that there is one comrade from California here in person to state his side or the other side of the contest. Why not arrange that the Committee on Contests go out and investigate the matter immediately and report back, as they ought to be able to do in a very few minutes, and then if these comrades from California are qualified they will no longer have a voice only, but will also have their vote in the congress. We want to recognize this, that a mere voice without a vote sometimes counts for a great deal. The one with the voice may have an advantage over the one with the voice and vote. Let us be fair to both sides and overlook the question of the prominence of delegates.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): It seems to me there is one party to this controversy that we have been rather inclined to overlook, and that is the great mass of the membership of the State of California that sent these delegates here. They are entitled to a voice on the floor of this congress and a vote. I want to know whether we propose to go on record as saying that any individual in any state who has a personal axe that he wants to grind and who sends a telegram just before the Congress is called to order, protesting against the seating of any delegate, can at once and for some hours, or for many minutes or seconds for that matter, deprive the membership of any state of a voice and vote at the important time of the organization of a congress. If there were contesting delegates on the floor, contesting delegates

here with credentials, then there would be no question whatever. But we have nothing before us except a telegram manifesting on its face not to be bona fide, because the very election which they claim to have taken place took place outside of the legal time allowed for the election of delegates.

DEL. KAPLAN: I rise to a point of order. The comrade is now going into the question of an investigation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is not well taken.

DEL. SIMONS: I am going into the question of whether or not this congress ought to consider this question or not, and whether or not this is a bona fide contest or a fraud, and I say it is a fraud. (Applause.) Therefore I hope that we will carry this motion to give these comrades a voice upon this floor. Give us an opportunity to select from those comrades in the making up of the organization and its committees, and give the comrades from California who are doing the work of the party an opportunity in the crucial hours of this Congress.

On motion of Del. Thompson the previous question was ordered.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will vote upon the motion now before you. The Secretary will read the motion.

The Secretary read: "Motion by Goebel, of New Jersey, that Delegates from California be seated with a voice but no vote until such time as the contest is decided."

The motion was carried.

COMMITTEE ON CONTESTED SEATS.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are still under clause 7 of the rules.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I believe a motion is in order here upon this point, and to facilitate the business of the congress I wish to make a motion that a committee on contested seats be appointed forthwith, to report as soon as possible. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean appointed or elected?

DEL. GAYLORD: Appointed.

DEL. ONEAL (Ind.): Elected.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make that as an amendment, Comrade Oneal?

DEL. D'ORSAY (Mass.): Do I understand Comrade Gaylord's motion to be that the Chair shall appoint this committee?

NATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Gaylord's motion is that the committee be appointed.

DEL. D'ORSAY: I think they ought to be elected.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make that as an amendment?

DEL. D'ORSAY: Yes. (Amendment seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you accept that, Comrade Gaylord?

DEL. GAYLORD: Hardly. The situation is not so serious as that. If we do not like what the Chairman does we can recall it.

The motion was put and the amendment was carried.

The following nominations for the Committee on Contested Seats were made: Kennedy, Pa.; Prevey, Ohio; McAllister, Mo.; Hoogerhyde, Mich.; DeBell, Mass.; Fraenckel, Ill.; Lewis, Ill.; Fackert, N. J. Several other delegates were nominated, but declined.

DEL. WOLFF (N. Y.): Jewish Agit. Bureau: I move that the eight nominees stand as such committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Eight is an even number. It is possible they will bring in two reports, one offsetting the other. It ought to be either five, seven, nine, eleven or any other odd number.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): There are eight nominees. I suggest that if any of the eight nominees came originally from California, that they ask that their names be withdrawn, and that will give us seven.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any ground for suspecting that any nominee is originally from California?

DEL. GOEBEL: I have ground to suspect Comrade Lewis being from California originally.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS (Ill.): I know the California situation, and that is the reason I want to be on the committee. I know the ground.

DEL. CUMBIE (Okla.): Is it not a fact that we have adopted a section providing for a definite number of committeeen, five?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a fact, and the point is well taken.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I move that the Chair proceed to call for a vote by a show of hands upon the nominees in the order they stand upon the secretary's minutes.

The motion was seconded and car-

ried, and Delegates Strebel and Thompson were appointed by the Chairman to count the vote.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I wanted very much to make it an odd number.

DEL. GAYLORD: I voted in favor of the motion fixing the number, so I move to reconsider that motion and to make the number seven.

THE CHAIRMAN: In view of the fact that we have not transacted any business between the two motions, I do not think the motion is in order. Let us proceed and have done with it. We want to do business expeditiously, but want to do it properly at the same time.

DEL. GOEBEL: I rise to a point of order. My point is that we have no rules of order yet, and therefore anything is in order, and therefore my point is that Comrade Gaylord's motion to make it seven at this time is in perfect order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Goebel's point of order is well taken. There is a motion before the house that the seven nominees stand as the committee.

DEL. ATWOOD (S. D.): I object. I want a separate vote taken on Arthur M. Lewis because he came originally from California.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the motion. All those in favor of the motion that the seven nominees for the Committee on Contested Seats stand as such committee, will please say Aye. Contrary. Ayes have it.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move that the committee retire immediately with the California delegation and bring in their report as soon as possible.

The motion was seconded and carried, and the committee and California delegation retired.

SMOKING.

DEL. CORY (Wash.): Mr. Chairman, and Delegates assembled: I do not want to put this in the form of a motion, but I want to make a request, if it so be, that the gentlemen who are smoking in this room desist while we are in session.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is not a motion. It is a request; so the delegates will please take notice.

DEL. CORY: We come from the Pacific Coast, where we are used to free air.

MORNING SESSION, MAY 15, 1910

RULES.

Consideration of the rules was continued.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I move the adoption of the remainder of Rule 8. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: I want to amend this before we adopt it. I believe that a committee of the National Congress, consisting of five members, is too small. The various states want to be represented with their different opinions and their conditions, and therefore I move to make it nine in each case instead of five. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Resolutions Committee and Committee on Constitution?

DEL. BERGER: The Resolutions and Constitution Committee, yes.

The amendment was adopted.

The next section of the Rules was read, as follows:

"9. The order of business after the election and appointment of such officers and committees shall be as follows: (a) Report of Committee on Contested Seats, if any; (b) Report of National Secretary; (c) Report of International Secretaries; (d) Election of International Secretaries; (e) Report on organization; (f) Report on general propaganda; (g) Reports on propaganda among women; (h) Report of Committee on Immigration, elected by convention of 1908; (i) Report of Committee on Agricultural Program, elected by convention of 1908; (j) Report of Committee on Constitution; (k) Report of Committee on Resolutions."

DEL. WORK (Ia.): It seems to me, in case of the election of international secretaries, new men might come before the International Congress, and therefore I move to strike out from subdivision (d) the election of international secretaries. (Seconded.)

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I move that in (g) it read, "Report of the National Women's Committee." (Seconded.)

DEL. BELL (Tex.): I move that the report of the Committee on Constitution occur immediately after the report on general propaganda. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We will take all the motions under Rule 9. Are there any further motions?

DEL. JACOBSEN (Ia.): I move that between (d) and (e) the follow-

ing be inserted: "Introduction of resolutions, amendments, etc." (Seconded.)

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I want to suggest through the Chair to the delegate that made the motion, that there is no necessity of a motion; that any time up to the time committees make their report any member of this body has a right to present anything to those committees. I see no use in changing the program.

DEL. JACOBSEN: It seems to me that the argument has all been centered on the amendment that I made. Now, I have a reason for that. I have several reasons for introducing that amendment.

DEL. GOEBEL: Then I withdraw the suggestion.

DEL. JACOBSEN (Ia.): Up to the present time, in the 1904 convention and also in the 1908 convention, committees to whom these things were referred without having been presented to the convention took it upon themselves, or at least contended that they had the right to do so, to kill measures. That is, perhaps, true where the matters had not originated in the convention proper and they might feel that the matter was not the property of the convention, not having been introduced there. Another line of argument that I wanted to present is simply this, that if the matter, resolutions or amendments are introduced in the convention all of the delegates will be familiar with what the committees are doing. Now, some delegate may perhaps introduce an amendment that another delegate may be violently opposed to. That other delegate would have just as much right to appear before the Committee on Resolutions or the Committee on Constitution as the delegate that introduced it. Many of the things that are thrashed out in the Congress would then be thrashed out before the committees, and we would save the time in the Congress and the committees would have the fights on their hands. I believe the amendment should be adopted.

DEL. HOOGERHYDE (Mich.): In regard to Rule 9, sections (h) and (i), I would like to ask as a point of information, if the report of the Committee on Immigration and the Committee on Agricultural Program would show the consideration of resolutions bearing on those questions, they could not come up in the regular order of the

Report of the Committee on Resolutions?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is unable to state. It will be within the province of the Congress at any time to decide upon those particular details of procedure.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): It seems to me the comrade is hindering his own cause, which I take to be that of liberty to introduce amendments and have them the property of the Congress and considered by it. We all have a right to introduce them at any time. I do not know why the question is brought up, because if they are properly introduced at any time they will simply be referred to the committee. I would not like to have a special time for their introduction, because I might not be present at that particular time. Let them be introduced at any time.

DEL. BELL (Tex.): I have been asked why I object to the motion to put the report on constitution following the report on general propaganda. I want to state, the reason for it was that I was a member of the Committee on Constitution two years ago, and my observation at that convention showed to me that the constitution matter was placed so late in the convention that a large number of delegates in favor of certain measures in that constitution were worn out, fatigued or had gone home, and I do not think the convention two years ago gave proper consideration to the constitution. That is the reason for my motion.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I object to Comrade Bell's motion for exactly the same reason. These committees that he wishes to displace with the Committee on Constitution are committees which have been in session and working for two years. They are permanent committees, and if it is a question of which is of the greater importance, the constitution or the three committees which have been working for two years, I am opposed to the motion.

DEL. WORK (Ia.): Are all these matters open for discussion?

THE CHAIRMAN: All under subdivision 9 of the Rules.

DEL. WORK: Then I want to say that heretofore we have not been allowed to introduce resolutions in the convention at all. They have never been read to the convention, but have been referred to the committees, so

that the comrade's argument does not stand good. And in regard to my motion to strike out the election of International Secretaries, I want to say that I have covered the point as to their election in my report on organization. I think they should be elected after the International Congress, because if we elected them beforehand, provided we elect new men to the position, we ought to allow the old ones to hold over until the International Congress is over. And as for the Committee on Constitution, it cannot possibly be ready to report by the time that Comrade Bell wants it placed here, and it will necessarily have to come after those who have already prepared their reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no further discussion we will take up the amendments as made under the different heads. The first one is subdivision (d), which Comrade Work moves to strike out. On this point I want to say a few words in explanation of the motives of the National Executive Committee in placing that on the order of business. It is customary in international congresses for the delegation from each country to elect their representatives on the bureau. As far as the Congress is concerned, the elections do not come from different parties. There may be instructions, but they come from so-called sections. For instance, the American section composed of the Socialist Party, the Socialist Labor Party and any labor organizations that may send representatives, must jointly elect two representatives on the bureau, they to serve until the next Congress. Now, in our case, we had one representative for some time, your humble servant, and the National Executive Committee some time ago decided to claim both seats as due us owing to our importance in the Socialist movement in this country, and Comrade Berger was elected a second secretary to the International Bureau. The object of placing this before the congress is to give the delegates to be elected by us specific instructions as to whom the membership wants elected as secretaries or representatives on the bureau, as these delegates will have to act on it in the next International Congress, whether it be decided otherwise or not.

DEL. WORK: If that is the situation I will withdraw my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Work withdraws his motion. The next proposed amendment is that under subdivision (g), that the report of the National Women's Committee take place in the order mentioned before the Propaganda Among Women. I wish to state that the National Executive Committee so decided, but it was too late to have it printed.

The motion was put and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next motion is to insert between (d) and (e) a new order, "Introduction of resolutions, amendments to the constitution, etc."

The motion was put and lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: The last proposed amendment is that the report of the Committee on Constitution be heard right after the report on general propaganda.

The motion was put and lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is now to adopt Rule 9 with the amendments as adopted.

The motion to adopt section 9 was carried.

The next section of the Rules was read, as follows:

10. All special reports and reports of special committees shall be read by the reading clerk. Discussions following such reports shall be limited to 15 minutes for each speaker. No delegate shall be allowed to speak twice on the same subject until those that have not spoken on it shall have had an opportunity to speak. The reporters and chairmen of committees shall have 30 minutes to close the discussion upon their respective reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to inform you, comrades, that the National Executive Committee substituted the word "may" for "shall." "Reports of special committees may be read by the reading clerk." It is not intended to prevent the reporter or chairman from reading it if desired.

DEL. MAURER (Pa.): I move to amend section 10 to read, "10 minutes" instead of "15 minutes," and that reporters and chairmen have 15 minutes instead of 30 minutes. (Seconded.)

DEL. ATWOOD (S. D.): I move to strike out 15 and insert 5, and to strike out 30 and insert 10. We can say all we want in that time. (Seconded.)

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): In these four or five days that we are going to be

here, I am going to try to confine myself within some reasonable bounds, and I suppose all the other delegates are going to try to do the same thing. But when I voted in the convention two years ago in favor of holding a Congress like this at intervals between our national elections; when I voted in the party referendum against doing away with that rule; when I accepted as a candidate to be a delegate to this Congress and when I voted for other delegates, I did it because I believed it would be worth while for us to have a congress where we would not simply come together and in an excited and disorderly manner take a lot of votes without any adequate discussion of the subject before us, but that we would have a congress where delegates from the party in every portion of the country could take up the very tremendous questions that we have upon our order of business and discuss them seriously and thoughtfully. (Applause.) Now, the delegate says here that he can tell all he knows in 5 minutes.

DEL. ATWOOD: Make it 15.

DEL. LEE: I am not of the opinion that any man can tell all he knows upon one of these large questions in 15 minutes. I restrain myself, however, from offering an amendment to increase the limit of time. I believe it is one of the greatest mistakes in American conventions and assemblies, where they should have a right to a full discussion, and in assemblies and conventions of our party in particular, to put a narrow time limit upon discussion. I should be willing to sit here and listen to men who have something to say upon various questions for the full 15 minutes. But I certainly do not think it is worth my while to come here from New York, nor worth any delegate's while to come here from his part of the country, to listen to a series of ten or five minute speeches in which no delegate will be actually able to develop his thought upon any serious question. Now, in the countries where our own party has a certain maturity and seriousness, where it does its work well, they do not follow this rule and attempt to cut out speeches. I am very heartily opposed to both amendments and am for the report of the committee.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I have looked forward with a great deal of interest to this Congress. I should be

NATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS

very sorry to see the profitableness of the Congress suffer by any limitation of the time. You need not worry about my taking 30 minutes, because I am not going to report on any committee so far as I know. But those that are to report, especially the reporters for the committees that have been constituted for two years, ought to be fully heard on the matters concerning which they report. Having had a little experience in reporting for committees, I know also that those who report ought to have plenty of time to sum up in closing, because there are many objections, many things come up in the course of the discussion on the floor, and you cannot answer in a short cross-fire. One needs time to develop a point very often. Questions and objections will arise because the point of view of the committee has been misunderstood. It seems to me that the purpose of this Congress is to increase the efficiency of the party. We do not get together enough. That is why we are not more efficient as a national party. We do not understand each other well enough, and so long as our discussions are orderly and not prolix, and they are thrashing out important questions, I am opposed to these amendments.

DEL. O'NEIL (Wyo.): I was a delegate to the national convention, and my observation was it is the national organizers or some other organizers who monopolize the time, and if that is to be the case there are some who are willing to go home without doing anything.

DEL. RINGLER (Pa.): I hope the delegates in this congress have self-control enough to limit themselves. It seems likely that some will get up and repeat and talk over the same thing time and time again, and we will find that some of the delegates will have to go home before the congress is over without the right to express their stand on the various matters under consideration, and I think that by all means we should adopt this time limit on the speakers.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): The reason I want the time limit left at least 15 minutes, is because the fellows that are not national organizers and not orators have no chance unless they have at least 15 minutes. The fellows that are using their tongues all the time don't need 15 minutes. They are on the

road, and they can stand up and unlimber the gun and be in action in 30 seconds, while a good sensible man needs time to forget that he is speaking. He needs at least 5 minutes, to forget that he is on the floor. The comrades, who are carpenters and blacksmiths, and well-diggers, and are not on the road all the time, are not used to quick talking or quick thinking, and it is in the interest of these comrades that I ask the time limit be left 15 minutes. It may be that these slow speakers and slow thinkers will take 10 minutes before they get down to business, but they will say more, after all, in the last 5 minutes than the organizers in their 15. They know the problems in their localities, and those are the men we want to hear from. Remember, this is not a convention, it is a congress, a conference. If I know anything about grammar, if I understand anything at all about the dictionary meaning of that word conference, it means to confer, and to confer means to talk over, and to talk over means to take the judgment of any member, whether he is a blacksmith, well-digger, carpenter, or national organizer. Now, Jim Carey, I know, will want at least 45 minutes, but I am sorry I can't make any limit to help you. (Laughter.)

DEL. WOLFF (N. Y.): I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been called for. You may put it down if you think it is premature. All those in favor—

DEL. ATWOOD (S. D.): I have instructions here, and I want a chance for the smaller states to be heard.

The delegate was interrupted by calls for the vote, but continued in an effort to speak.

The motion for the previous question was carried.

The various amendments were lost, and the original proposition was adopted.

The next section of the rules was read, as follows:

"11. The regular sessions of the congress shall be opened at 9:30 A. M. and shall be held from 9:30 A. M. to 12:30 P. M., and from 2 P. M. to 6 P. M. If any night sessions are to be held they shall be opened at 8 P. M. and close at 10 P. M. Night sessions shall be held only when decided upon

MORNING SESSION, MAY 15, 1910

by a resolution during the day's proceedings."

DEL. ZITT (Ohio): I move that this congress decide not to hold any night sessions. (Seconded.)

The motion was held to be out of order, on the ground that there would be no night sessions unless specifically voted by the congress.

The rule was then adopted.

Section 12 was read, as follows:

"12. Roberts' Rules of Order shall be used."

"13. Each delegation, in the absence of any regular delegates, shall designate the alternate who shall fill the vacancy."

The rule having originally read "delegate" instead of "delegation," and a question having arisen, the Chairman explained that the word "delegate" was an error in print, and that it would be amended to read "state delegation."

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of substituting the word "delegation" for the word "delegate," so that the rule reads "each state delegation, in the absence of any regular delegate, shall designate the alternate who shall fill the vacancy," will please say aye. Contrary. So ordered.

The next and concluding rule was read, as follows:

"14. The National Secretary and the members of the National Executive Committee shall each have a voice but no vote in the Congress. Members of committees, who are not delegates, shall have the right to participate in discussions on the subjects of their reports."

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I do not know of any reason why you should give the members of the National Executive Committee a special privilege here. I like to hear the gentle voices of Comrades Lewis, Hunter, and Spargo just as well as any of the rest of you, and I believe they are the only members of the Executive Committee who are not delegates, but I do not know of any reason why they should have any special privilege when their states have not seen fit to elect them as delegates. I do see why the National Secretary should have a voice, because he cannot be a delegate, for the reason that he is too busy to act as a delegate, and for that reason I move that the first sentence be amended so as to read, "The National Secretary shall have a voice but no vote in the Congress."

(Seconded.)

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Just a word on this. If this were a regular convention, then I would fight for that. But I am unalterably against seating the members of the National Executive Committee who are not delegates. Let us try and keep clearly in our minds that this is a congress. This is not a regular convention. This is a congress, this is a conference. And your executive committee, after all, are your servants. Some of the comrades seem to think they are your masters, but they are your servants, and even though it is a laudable ambition to desire to be a member of the National Executive Committee, they are there to serve you, simply because you want to use them. If you want them to have a voice, all right, give them a voice, but don't give them a vote. If any questions come before you in reference to propaganda, or in reference to other national matters, they will be free to give you the information, therefore, I would say, give them a voice but no vote.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): If this is passed as it stands, will a member of the National Executive Committee, who has been elected a delegate, be excluded from a vote in the congress? The first sentence reads, "The National Secretary and members of the National Executive Committee shall each have a voice, but no vote."

THE CHAIRMAN: That was caused by the printer's devil. The original rules read, "And members of the National Executive Committee who shall not be delegates to the congress."

DEL. GAYLORD: That settles it. "Not delegates," I see. All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

DEL. MAYNARD (Colo.): I am very much in favor of this part of the regulations presented. A vote given to seven of our membership by the vote of the entire membership throughout the country certainly ought to have some respect from this congress, elected only by people from their own state. I think it would be absurd if persons who are honored by the vote of the entire membership should be refused a voice on any subject they cared to discuss before this congress. (Applause.)

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): We have just had a limited discussion in regard to the value of time at the disposal of the delegates to this congress, and the plea, the special plea, made for extending the

NATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS

time was made in behalf of the blacksmiths and carpenters who came here and could not forget they were on their feet for the first five or ten minutes. That was the argument. The comrades who are now presented the special right of this floor are fortunate in being able to have the ears of the party at large. Every week in the year, their books, their pamphlets and their articles are constantly before the eyes of our comrades all over the United States so that we have a conception of what their attitude and position in the party is. But here are gathered together a number of obscure men and women, if you please. They have been deliberately selected by their comrades to come here and participate in this congress. And now you want to introduce men and women who have not been elected as delegates, to consume the time. I believe in the lower limit that was presented here, and then reversed by Comrade Goebel to give the carpenters and blacksmiths a chance.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): I do not want the National Executive Committee to be on the floor of this congress as privileged members of it. I never have had any sympathy with the idea that a position in the Socialist Party was a privilege. I want those members here, because I want to know where they stand. I want the benefit of their information and knowledge. I want them here because they know things, and I want them to have an opportunity to tell them here on this floor. I do not think there will be any objection to

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Congress was called to order at 3:15 P. M.

HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST SOCIETIES.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Cal.): The Hungarian Socialist Society has sent delegates to this congress, but their secretary did not have the time to notify the National Secretary, and these delegates now ask to be admitted with voice and vote. I move you that they be so admitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: With voice, but not a vote?

DEL. UNTERMANN: With voice and vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The other representatives of foreign speaking organizations are admitted with voice but

giving some ten or fifteen delegates from foreign speaking organizations duplicate representation on this floor, because the members of those organizations know something that we want to know in a special field. We have put these men there and they have done their duty, as I think, and if we have put them there and they have done their duty, they have something that we want to know. If that is a privilege, it is an exact reversal of the Socialist position all over the world.

DEL. AMERINGER (Okla.): I am one of the obscurities, but I want to say this: This is a stockholders' meeting of the great Socialist Party corporation, and our Executive Committee is our board of directors, and they come before you on some matters pertaining to the welfare of this organization and we want reports from those who are on the board, who are on the inside and are able to give information to the obscure fellows outside. Now, I as one of the obscurities am perfectly willing to sit and listen to the fellows that we have engaged to do our work. (Applause.)

On motion of Del. D'Orsay the previous question was ordered.

The amendment to strike out "members of the National Executive Committee" was lost.

The original rule, corrected as read by the Chairman, was the adopted.

On motion, the congress then at 1:30 P. M. adjourned until 3 o'clock P. M.

not a vote. Are the comrades representing the Hungarian Socialists present?

DEL. UNTERMANN: Here they are.

SECRETARY BARNES: These two comrades were in the office this morning. Later, in this hall another comrade came in and presented a document, alleging that he was a delegate. I do not understand Hungarian. I wish the chairman or someone who understands the language would inquire into the facts.

DEL. HERMANOVITCH: We have our credentials.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you written credentials from your organization?

DEL. HERMANOVITCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have two let-

AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 15, 1910

ters here, upon the letter head of the Hungarian organization apparently, as it bears the seal of the Hungarian Socialist Federation. What is your pleasure? The motion is that these delegates be seated with a voice, but no vote, as are the representatives of the other foreign speaking organizations.

DEL. KLAWIER (Pa.), Polish Section: So far as I know, there are two sections of these Hungarian Socialists. One of them, I understand, is affiliated with the Socialist Party and the other is outside the party. All the other foreign delegates here are directly connected with the Socialist Party.

DEL. HERMANOVITCH: We represent a Socialist branch here in Chicago. Comrade Fraenkel knows us personally.

COM. HUNTER: I move you, Comrade Chairman, that the matter be referred to Secretary Barnes to consult with any one whom he wishes to consult, and report back to the congress.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that the question of seating these delegates be referred to Comrade Barnes with instructions to investigate and report.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I think that the Hungarian Socialist Federation is very well known as a Hungarian Socialist Party organization, doing business in the Hungarian language, and I do not see why the presentation of these credentials with the statement of the delegates that they do represent the Hungarian branches affiliated with the party should not be sufficient.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion that they be seated on the same terms as the representatives of the other foreign speaking organizations. There is an amendment to refer the matter to Comrade Barnes for investigation and report. Those in favor of the amendment will please say aye.

The amendment was carried.

ROLL CALL.

The Secretary then called the roll, which showed the following present who had not responded at the roll call at the morning session: G. A. Peterson, Illinois; James A. DeBell, Massachusetts; Frank Aaltunen, Michigan; Morris Kaplan, Minnesota; Joseph E. Cohen, Ed. Moore, James H. Maurer, Pennsylvania; Finnish Section, John Valimaki, Michigan.

Delegate William Adams, of Wil-

kinsburg, reported as alternate for John W. Slayton of McKeesport, Pa.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SECRETARY BARNES ON HUNGARIAN REPRESENTATION.

SEC. BARNES: I find that the national secretary of the Hungarian organization misunderstood the apportionment of representatives. He understood that the foreign speaking organizations were entitled to three representatives. I think therefore, these comrades who have first presented their credentials ought to be seated.

THE CHAIRMAN: What shall we do with the report of the Secretary?

DEL. KILLINGBECK (N. J.): I move the two delegates be seated.

The motion was seconded and carried.

DEL. LONDON (N. Y.), Jewish Agit. Bureau: I would like to know whether there is anything to prevent the foreign speaking delegations from having a vote?

THE CHAIRMAN: The constitution provides that delegates may be elected by the membership of the respective states at the ratio of one for each five hundred members. All the members of the foreign speaking organizations have had their vote in electing the delegates to this congress the same as other English speaking delegates. If now they should be given a vote as foreign speaking organizations they would have two votes.

The next business is the election of permanent secretary to serve throughout the Congress.

PERMANENT SECRETARY.

On motion of Comrade Work, duly seconded, Delegate George E. Roewer, Jr., of Massachusetts, was elected the permanent secretary of the Congress.

On Motion of Delegate Killingbeck, Delegates Frank Hubschmitt, of New Jersey, and Robt. B. Ringler, of Pennsylvania, were elected assistant secretaries.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

Comrade Charles Drees, on the suggestion of the Chairman, was elected sergeant-at-arms, with power to appoint five messengers.

TELLERS.

Delegates Bloor (Conn.), Silver (Me.), Strelbel (N. Y.), and Tom J. Lewis (Ore.) were elected tellers.

JUDGES.

Delegates James Oneal (Ind.) and W. W. Passage (N. Y.) were elected as judges.

READING CLERK.

Delegate Gustave Strebel, of New York, was appointed reading clerk.

RIGHTS OF FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

DEL LONDON (N. Y.): I would like to have a definite ruling on the question of our right to vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the Chair, in the best light he has, is, that the representatives of the foreign speaking organizations are not delegates, but are entitled to a voice in the deliberations of the congress. But in the opinion of the Chairman they are not entitled to vote for committees or to be elected as members of committees of the congress.

DEL. LONDON: May I be permitted to argue this?

THE CHAIRMAN: The only way to get this before the house is to take an appeal from the ruling of the chair.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I move that the ruling of the chairman be made the ruling of this congress.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the ruling of the chair be made the rule of the congress.

DEL. LONDON: As representative of the Jewish Agitation Bureau, I wish to speak to this. I believe the representatives of the foreign speaking organizations should have the right to be elected to the various committees. They are all organizations of the Socialist Party. All of them have taken up the work of carrying on the organization of the Socialist Party within the limits of their tongue. They do the work of the Socialist Party in their particular tongue. Some of these organizations are extremely important. There is one organization with a membership of 6,000, and there is no reason in the world why a delegate representing an organization of 6,000 Socialists should not be on the committees of this body. It is true that he would not have the right to vote. But the committees do not decide matters. The committee brings these matters before the con-

gress and the congress then decides them. As a member of the committee he will have the opportunity to present the situation from his standpoint, to explain the situation from the standpoint of the foreign speaking organization, so far as their methods of propaganda are concerned, and so far as the effectiveness of their organization is concerned. Therefore I ask the delegates to vote against this construction and decision of the chair.

DEL. HUBSCHMITT (N. J.): I take issue with Comrade London. It is true that these comrades represent organizations of the Socialist Party, but the foreign speaking comrades have already had a vote in electing the delegates to this congress. They were there on equal terms with all other members of the party. In the privilege which these organizations enjoy of having special representatives present, they are enjoying a double privilege, something to the disadvantage of the other comrades. In other words, they are having the right to vote twice. I think the ruling of the Chair is fair and democratic.

DEL. KLAWIER (Pa.): It is not a question of having a double vote or a double voice in this congress. As a matter of fact, a good many foreign organizations being affiliated with the Socialist Party do not participate in the votes of the Socialist Party for the simple reason that you send out the referendum of the party in the English language. These people cannot read the English language and as a matter of fact they are not participating in the voting system. And even suppose they were participating and were voting for our candidates, don't you know that we are in a hopeless minority so that we can not elect a single member to this body, to represent our interests? There are other disadvantages. We are divided into Polish, Jewish, German, Scandinavian and Finnish; and you people are united. We are separate bodies and vote as separate bodies. We have no chance to stand as a unit in order to bring our candidates down here to represent our ideas and demands. Furthermore, I do not believe especially that our American born comrades can decide or have the right to decide what kind of propaganda the foreign speaking organizations have to make in the United States in order to bring the foreign speaking population into the movement. As a matter of fact our comrades in the industrial

centers know that the foreigners are affected differently to the native born citizens.

Specially on the committee on constitution and the committee on resolutions we should like to be represented in order to bring in some of our amendments and speak on them. We believe we should have at least two of our members on those committees. If you people are going to decide that we have no right to vote, we should be on those committees in order to bring before this body our amendments to the constitution and our resolutions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I may state to the comrade that the representatives of the foreign speaking organizations have a full and perfect right to bring any recommendation before those committees.

DEL. ROSE (Miss.): I read on this list that these comrades are delegates. Now we are told that they are visitors. It seems to me that they should have the full voting power, the same as the rest of us. If no motion has been made, and it is in order at the present time to make such a motion, I move that these representatives be given a voice and vote, the same as other delegates. I think is is only right and fair that these comrades should be accepted as full delegates to this congress.

A DELEGATE: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will declare that part of the motion which relates to giving a vote to the representatives of the foreign speaking organizations out of order, because it is not within the power of the congress to confer any such rights. On the other portion of the question as to the rights of these representatives to be elected to committees, or to make nominations, or to participate in the general proceedings of the congress we may act as we please.

DEL. HOLM (Ill.), Scand.: If the chairman is sustained, are the representatives of the Scandinavians deprived of the right to make nominations?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. WOLFF (N. Y.): The reason I think the representatives of the foreign speaking organizations should be permitted to be represented as members of committees is that the chair has ruled and it is the understanding of all of us that we have the right to go to these committees and make suggestions, and say, I move this

or that or the other, and the committees will listen to our suggestions. We want to bring up any such motions as we feel will be for the interest of the Socialist Party in helping us to organize the foreign speaking population, the foreign speaking workingmen. We want to be able to discuss these resolutions with these committees. If we are only delegates, who are graciously permitted to make suggestions, we cannot accomplish the results we seek.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I find on the list here from Michigan Frank Aaltonen, whom I take to be one of the Finnish comrades; I find Mrs. Esther Laukki and Leo Laukki, from Minnesota, who, unless I am very much mistaken, are Finnish comrades elected by the Socialists of Minnesota; and in the state of Wisconsin the state secretary informs me that the Finnish comrades and the Polish comrades participated in the state referendum in choosing representatives of this body. Now, Comrade Chairman, I cannot see why double representation should be given to those who are paying dues in the regular fashion.

I want to inquire of the comrades who are urging this action, whether the organizations of the Socialist Party have ever opposed a proposition relating to methods of propaganda among the foreign speaking people of this country?

DEL. LONDON (N. Y.): It has not been sufficiently enlightened.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I am trying to get the information.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is hardly the way to get it. You make your statement. And if it should not be true, you will get all the information you will care about after a while.

DEL. GAYLORD: The Chairman's suggestion is a good one. The proposition, then, as I understand it, is this: there has never been any opposition to well considered plans of propaganda among the foreign people. There never has been in Wisconsin; and there has not been in any other state so far as I am aware. We have sometimes, I might say, opposed plans that we knew would not meet the necessities of the case. I went to emphasize this point, however. The Socialist Party is a political party, organized for political action. As such I think we are justified in insisting on unity of methods throughout. I do not wish to bring

Milwaukee too much to the front. But we know a little about effective propaganda, in Milwaukee, and we think it calls for unity, and not for too much scattered individual effort. We have had comrades there of various nationalities, and we found our way to work together, but not by their coming in as special representatives with special privileges, but they have come into our meetings as members, stayed as regular members, and have had regular delegates.

That is the point that I want to make here; that those comrades have double representation; that is, a special privilege, that is extra; that is a privilege that nobody else has. We could organize a German propaganda; we could do it mighty easy too. I don't say that should be done. I do not say that it would not be better to confine their representation to the regular channels of the party and send up your delegates on the regular list of delegates. You could do it. In Milwaukee especially you could it. It makes for unity.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): The question of the method in which the foreign speaking organizations of the Socialist Party shall participate in the work of the Socialist Party of the United States is one of the things that this congress must determine. There will be no stop of these foreign speaking organizations until they get the direct action of this party, until the Socialist Party of the United States will recognize the fact that the foreign speaking organizations shall have such a position in this organization as their condition and their numbers in the United States determine. There will be no stop by these organizations until they are recognized in their right position. We have never recognized the position of the foreign speaking organizations in the United States. One of the reasons, comrades, is this: that a great many of them, hundreds and thousands of them, are scattered through the United States, in lumber camps, in railroad camps, and in every other department of human activity in America, where the average English speaking Socialist does not see what is going on all around them.

This is not a convention. You must distinguish between a convention and a congress. A congress is called for the specific purpose of doing something for propaganda and organization. A convention is called for the specific purpose

of doing something for immediate political action. A congress is called for the purpose of getting better action on the part of the organization. Where we have fallen down in the past is that we have failed to recognize that here in Chicago and in other industrial centers at least fifty per cent or more of the people who are Socialists are foreign speaking Socialists and it would be the height of folly to say to these foreign speaking people of these various cities, you shall not have a voice or vote on these committees. Are they going to out vote anybody? If they are allowed on these committees, even if these foreign speaking comrades shall be on these committees and have a voice and vote to determine what shall be done, is that going to change the result of our action in any particular? This has nothing to do with an election. It only deals with conditions within the Socialist Party organization. For that reason, if for no other, these foreign speaking organizations should have representation on these committees. They hate to be governed by people who don't understand their tongue; they hate to be governed by a constitution that does not correspond to the situation so far as the foreign speaking Socialists of the United States are concerned. We have not grasped that situation.

In the United States there are millions and millions of people who have votes, who are anxious to work with us for Socialism if we give them a chance; and here, in the first congress of the Socialist Party of the United States, let us give them a chance.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): By accident I happen to be State Secretary of Massachusetts. I want to say, because of conversation with some of the delegates immediately coexistent with me here, that there is some misunderstanding. Now in Massachusetts—and I presume it may be true in other states—we have some organizations of foreign speaking Socialists. They are part of the Massachusetts movement. When we called for delegates to this congress the state secretary informed all the clubs and organizations that we were entitled to six delegates to this congress. Finnish and Jewish clubs, and German clubs—we have not many—and the English speaking clubs, were all invited to nominate candidates for delegates to the National Congress. Then the state office asked the various

candidates whether they would accept. And then all that are regularly named are submitted to whom? To the Finnish and the Jewish and the Italian clubs and they all take part in their election.

In Massachusetts we have, according to the last official figures, something like 756 Finnish comrades. That is twenty less than we had two years ago. If the Finnish comrades of Massachusetts wanted to plump their vote, as they do in some other places, and as other people do in other portions of the country, they could have elected the entire six delegates. I happened to have the highest vote and only got seven hundred. Two Finnish comrades ran. There were two or three Jewish comrades nominated by Jewish or English speaking clubs, and they all took part in the election. If they had voted together to the full extent of their voting strength the comrades of Massachusetts could have been represented here by six Finnish delegates, which undoubtedly would have been an improvement. They took part in the nomination and in the election of the delegates, they nominated candidates and voted on the candidates submitted. We have a Jewish delegate from Massachusetts; the first Socialist I ever knew was a Jew. He taught me what little I know, and he is still at it. Now the Jewish comrades of Massachusetts could very well ask—I speak of the Jewish state committee of Massachusetts—they could also ask for a special representation; and if an Irish socialist movement began in Massachusetts, why should not the Irish demand representation?

A DELEGATE: How about the Germans?

DEL. CAREY: Of course, I am not Irish. Now here is the situation; and it is a serious proposition. Suppose that in the state of Massachusetts the Finns, or the Irish, or the Italians were in the majority and they elected delegates here of their nationality and the English speaking comrades should come here and ask for representation, what would they say? The Finnish, and Italian, and Jewish, and all the other organizations of Massachusetts are part of the Socialist movement; they nominate candidates when they are called for on a general ballot; they have just as much right to vote upon those candidates as I or any other person who might want me, or this or

that class or nationality, and they were not defeated because they were Finns or something else; they were simply defeated in the general election; many English speaking comrades were defeated. What is the thing that is best to be done?

THE CHAIRMAN: May I call your attention to the fact that we are not now discussing the best plans for organizing non-English speaking Socialists. The only question here now is in this particular congress, whether the representatives of these foreign speaking organizations should have the right to nominate members of committees, or to be elected to committees. The other question will come up under organization and propaganda.

DEL. CAREY: That is quite true; but the original question was as to giving the right to vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was settled.

DEL. CAREY: Then I have said all I have to say; and when the other subject comes up I will keep quiet.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): I want to say that there has been a misunderstanding on this question; and there have been misunderstandings in our locals. The question comes to this, practically: if they serve on these committees, are they to get representation that others do not by reason of the fact of their language? They are represented here. They are represented in my state as they are in the state of the comrade who has just sat down. If they are represented once, why need they be represented again? My name is Collins, a good Irish name. Why could not the Irish ask to be represented on those committees? I for one demand that at this congress we shall try to discuss how we are to get at the other fellows.

The previous question having been moved and seconded, was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before you is, that the ruling of the chair be made the ruling of the house. The ruling of the chair was, that the representatives of the foreign speaking organizations should be entitled to a voice on the floor of this congress, but not to participate in the active work of the organization in making nominations, or being elected to committees. All those in favor of the ruling of the chair will say aye.

The motion, as stated by the chair, was carried.

ROLL CALL.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I rise to make a motion. On the rules of order for this body you have forgotten one important thing. I move you, Comrade Chairman, that in voting on reports of committees, and on the important acts of this congress, a roll call vote be taken.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have adopted rules of order; and the roll call will be taken whenever properly called for by the meeting.

CONTESTED SEATS.

I understand that the committee on contested seats is ready to report. If the congress does not object, we will hear the report.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS (Ill.): The only contest presented to the committee is in regard to California. The committee elected by you has listened to all the evidence presented by both parties to the dispute, and presents the following statement as embodying its conclusions as the report of this committee:

After listening to the evidence presented by all parties to this contest, we are unanimously of opinion that the objections to seating the claimants to represent California should not be sustained. The main objection that these delegates were elected by the executive committee of California, and not by the larger body, should be set aside, and not recognized, because the evidence shows to our satisfaction, that, had the delegates not been selected in this manner, California, owing to the shortness of time, could not have been represented in this congress.

As to the telegram read to the congress, objecting to the seating of Delegate Osborne, we find it to be not official and unsupported by any evidence.

We therefore have no hesitation in recommending unanimously to this congress to seat the five delegates from California, namely, Wilson, Carpenter, Osborne, Untermann and Wilde.

Signed by all the members of the committee.

DEL. COLLINS: I move that the report of the committee be received and adopted.

The motion was seconded and carried.

NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

The following nominations were made for this committee:

E. L. Cannon, Oregon; Adolph Germer, Illinois; T. J. Lewis, Oregon; Walter Lanfersiek, Kentucky; W. B. Killingbeck, New Jersey; E. H. Thomas, Wisconsin; A. M. Simons, Illinois; John G. Willert, Ohio; C. C. Allen, Florida; Jos. E. Cohen, Pennsylvania; W. H. Waynick, Washington; T. J. Coonrod, Idaho; E. Untermann, California; Algernon Lee, New York; S. W. Rose, Mississippi; M. T. Maynard, Colorado; H. D'Orsay, Massachusetts; Jasper McLevy, Connecticut.

A number of nominees declined, leaving the following as the candidates: Delegates Willert, Cannon, McLevy, Cohen, Waynick, Lee, Killingbeck, Thomas, Germer.

On motion of Del. Lewis, of Oregon, the nine remaining candidates were declared elected by acclamation.

COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

The following nominations were made for the Committee on Constitution:

Clyde J. Wright, Nebraska; Geo. H. Goebel, New Jersey; Walter Lanfersiek, Ky.; John M. Work, Ia.; Victor L. Berger, Wis.; T. J. Morgan, Ill.; T. J. Lewis, Ore.; W. T. Brown, Utah; W. Carpenter, Cal.; Caroline A. Lowe, Kan.; Ella Reeve Bloor, Conn.; W. P. Collins, Colo.; J. T. Cumbie, Okla.; W. J. Bell, Tex.; W. R. Gaylord, Wis.; Jos. Wanhope, N. Y.; Ed. Moore, Pa.; S. M. Reynolds, Ind.; Henry Kummerfeld, Mich.; Oscar Ameringer, Okla.; J. S. Wilson, Cal.; J. F. Carey, Mass.; John Heckala, Wyo.

The following delegates declined the nomination:

Delegates Wright, Berger, Brown, Lewis, Cumbie, Wanhope, Carey, Heckala, Lanfersiek.

The following therefore became the nominees for the Committee on Constitution:

Delegates Goebel, Work, Morgan, DeBell, Carpenter, Lowe, Bloor, Collins, Bell, Gaylord, Moore, Reynolds, Kummerfeld, J. S. Wilson.

DEL. LEWIS (Ore.): I move that the election shall be by ballot.

The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection to it, the National Secretary will have the names printed on the ballots, to be distributed to-morrow.

morning, and the vote taken on the printed ballot.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I am going to oppose it. (Laughter). I want to say to you, comrades, who are laughing, it is convenient to have a comrade to oppose things sometimes. That is the way you get the other side. I am going to oppose this action for this reason. At least one half and perhaps two thirds of those who are in this congress have been in similar conventions in the past, and with the experience of those other conventions in mind, and looking over the order of business and seeing the number of very important matters that are to come before this congress, those comrades know that in four days it is going to be a miracle, if we get half way through the business before us. That means that we must save time somewhere. I say, let us make this the closing business for today and vote on this committee now. Let us get it done. It will take but a little more time than if they were printed, but if the secretary will read

the names slowly you can put this entire list on a piece of paper, mark an X opposite the names you wish to vote for and it will mean half a day saved.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your motion?

DEL. GOEBEL: My motion is that we proceed to ballot at once for members of the Committee on Constitution. The motion was carried.

The ballots were then distributed and afterwards collected by the tellers.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SECRETARY BARNES.

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall next have the report of the National Secretary, Comrade Barnes.

SEC. BARNES: The report will be read from manuscript. The printed copies will be distributed to-morrow.

THE CHAIRMAN: And in other cases they will be distributed immediately after reading the reports.

The National Secretary then read his report as follows:

REPORT OF NATIONAL SECRETARY.

Comrade Delegates and Comrades of America:

This Congress, I believe, will mark an epoch in the history of Socialism in America. It affords the first opportunity to party representatives to apply themselves to those most important questions of organization, agitation and propaganda unhampered by the usual campaign work.

Moreover, in this departure we are following the example set by the comrades in older and more experienced movements.

It is a truism that the stranger and those without the gates are mistrusted. On the other hand, personal contact removes misunderstandings, promotes harmony and dissolves imaginary differences.

To this purpose it is especially advantageous that representatives of a movement covering such an extended territory as America should frequently foregather.

But provision must be made so that the resultant expense will not fall as a super-burden upon the membership, or, worse still, result in absorbing the national organization funds to the extent of interfering with the regular and necessary agitation.

It so happens that this Congress timely precedes the meeting of the International Socialist and Trade Union Congress, to be held at Copenhagen, beginning August 28th of the current year, and that, therefore, many of the documents or subjects here submitted or discussed will come fresh to the attention of the Socialists of the world via advance submissions by the International Socialist Bureau and the report of the International Congress.

The Bureau in preparation for the Congress makes the specific request for reports from affiliated parties for the period beginning with 1907, and that the documents be printed of uniform size, and that one thousand be supplied in each language, English, German and French. It also requests that one identical order in presentation of subjects treated should be followed. The arrangements of this report is made accordingly.

The National Executive Committee, in order to make it suitable for a report of the American party to the International Congress, adopted the following motions:

"That the National Secretary be instructed to prepare a report and submit it to this committee."

"That the National Secretary's report be submitted in compliance with the requirements of the Socialist Bureau."

ORGANIC LAW AND REFERENDUMS.

Since the last convention, by which the constitution was reconstructed, it has been changed by national party referendums as follows:

January 31, 1909.—The provision for the election of the National Executive Committee and a National Secretary by the National Committee was substituted by a provision for the election of these officers by national party referendum, employing the preferential system and arranging the candidates in alphabetical groups, according to their own choice.

By the same referendum the provision for mileage assessments for conventions and congresses was stricken out and a provision to set aside ten per cent of the national dues monthly for this purpose was substituted.

The same referendum abolished the time limit (90 days) for the required number of seconds to initiate a national party referendum. The vote on the several propositions ranged: Highest affirmative, 10,158; lowest affirmative, 6,730; highest negative, 5,725; lowest negative, 1,813.

November 10, 1909.—To strike out the alphabetical group provision on the ballot for national officers and providing for elections in odd numbered years; requiring nominations by five locals to qualify candidates, and introducing a system for the rotation of the position of the candidates, each to occupy in turn the favored position on an equal number of ballots. First proposition: Affirmative, 3,920; negative, 1,688. Second proposition: Affirmative, 3,167; negative, 2,415.

February 9, 1910.—Eliminating from the laws relating to the election of national officers the preferential system of voting and the rotating of position of candidates upon the ballot. First proposition: Affirmative, 6,014; negative, 2,865. Second proposition: Affirmative, 5,183; negative, 3,352.

REFERENDUM PROPOSITIONS DEFEATED.

April 24, 1909.—Providing that the National Executive Committee shall be permanently employed in the National Headquarters and constitute the office force, and to increase the membership dues to twenty cents a month, the amount to be equally divided between the state and national organizations. By a vote ranging: Highest affirmative, 4,052; lowest affirmative, 2,439; highest negative, 8,493; lowest negative, 6,483.

February 10, 1910.—Providing a substitute of an entire new constitution, containing the following provisions: Fixing the salary of the National Secretary at \$75 a month; locating the National Headquarters in the residence of the Secretary; eliminating the National Executive Committee and National Committee; the election of a campaign committee of five to serve during the presidential campaigns; the nomination of political candidates by referendum; each organized state to contribute \$5 per month for the support of the national organization, etc. Affirmative, 2,334; negative, 9,318.

April 6, 1910.—To strike out the provision for National Party Congresses. Affirmative, 3,740; negative, 5,020.

In the July (1909) session the National Executive Committee adopted the following motion:

"That we recommend to the National Committee that the compensation of national organizers be fixed at \$4 a day and expenses."

This action arose from the recognition of the fact that the unions pay their organizers a higher rate than does the Socialist Party, which rate is usually determined by or relating to their prevailing wage scale. And, further, as stated by the committee: "Feeling the force of the widespread criticism that our national organizers have not successfully reached the organized workers of the country, the National Executive Committee undertook to send special organizers into the trade unions. This work, so far as tried, has proven to be more productive of good results than any other form of propaganda.

"For this work we have found it necessary to secure the services of the most capable and energetic comrades actively engaged in trade union work. But, in order to obtain the services of such comrades, we find it absolutely necessary to pay wages

equal, or nearly equal, to the recognized trade union rate of wages. Further—quite apart from the fact that such men cannot be otherwise enlisted in the work—we believe that the Socialist Party should, as a matter of principle, scorn to pay low wages to its servants."

The above motion was passed upon by the National Committee and adopted August 30, 1909, by the following vote: Affirmative, 32; negative, 19; not voting, 8.

February 9, 1910.—The following National Party Referendum was adopted: "Instructing the National Committee to restore the old rate of \$3 a day and expenses to national organizers and speakers. Affirmative, 5,740; negative, 3,071.

On September 7, 1909, the National Party Platform was amended in the following manner:

By striking out the words "and all land" from No. 2 of the General Demands.

By inserting the following paragraph in the Principles, immediately following the words "and have fitted them for collective use and operation": "There can be no absolute private title to land. All private titles, whether called fee simple or otherwise, are and must be subordinate to the public title. The Socialist Party strives to prevent land from being used for the purpose of exploitation and speculation. It demands the collective possession, control or management of land to whatever extent may be necessary to attain that end. It is not opposed to the occupation and possession of land by those using it in a useful and bona fide manner without exploitation." First proposition: Affirmative, 5,382; negative, 3,117. Second proposition: Affirmative 5,926; negative, 2,565.

In the matter of referendums and to prevent contradictory ones following close upon each other, and for the purpose of eliminating those of minor import, and confining general action to such questions as changes of law or policy or administrative control, the time limit should again be introduced, within which reasonable period the sufficient number of endorsements must be forthcoming.

PARTY MANAGEMENT.

The supreme power of the party is vested in the membership referendum, followed in authority by party conventions or congresses, and the National Executive Committee for matters of immediate administration or of an executive character, their acts being subject to review by the National Committee, the latter having, as between the two, the superior power in initiating new work or defining new policies.

The National Committee, composed of one representative from each organized state and an additional one for every two thousand members or major fraction thereof, is empowered to meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so. However, there has been no meeting of this committee since the one held in St. Louis in January, 1903, and all its business in the interim has been transacted by correspondence.

Thirty-seven motions arose and were submitted during the year 1907; forty-one motions during the year 1908; ten motions during the year 1909, and three motions thus far in 1910.

Most of these motions were upon administrative matters or related to timely party action on current public questions. Besides, this body has elected various committees and sub-committees and an additional international secretary in the person of Comrade Victor L. Berger.

In like manner the National Executive Committee is authorized to meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so, and since the last convention (May, 1908) eleven sessions, each occupying two or more days, have been held, as follows:

DURING 1908: May 18th—When proper arrangements were made for carrying forward the decisions of the convention and the required referendums relating to the same; a permanent woman's organizer was appointed; the long standing Nebraska controversy was settled, and account was taken of the National Office finances and prospects for the ensuing campaign.

June 11—Speakers for the campaign were selected; a tentative route was made up for the presidential candidates; literature and advertising matter was decided upon for the campaign, including a farmers' leaflet; the Minnesota comrades were advised to pay the filing fee under protest and attack the primary law in the courts after the election; it was also decided to give some special attention to those congressional districts that seemed most promising of success; Comrade Joseph Medill Patterson was delegated to prepare a campaign book.

July 10th—Provisions were made for the publication of several leaflets and pamphlets; the Proceedings of the Convention were ordered published and Comrade Work was appointed to edit the same. The question of employing a Socialist Special campaign train was thoroughly discussed and endorsed, and a special appeal was authorized for financing the campaign train.

August 15th—The subject of the special train was the main topic of discussion and the National Secretary was instructed to complete the arrangements and sign a contract with Mr. Yerex for the tour as planned up to September 25th—from Chicago to the Pacific Coast and return.

December 18th—Committees were appointed to make reports at the next meeting on the subjects of Organization, Study Courses in Socialism, Meetings, Literature, Press, Trade Union Movement, Propaganda Among Farmers and Campaign Methods; the National Committee was requested to elect an additional international secretary; regulations for foreign speaking organizations were considered; notice was taken of the assault made editorially by the American Federationist regarding the finances of the Socialist campaign; a bond for the National Secretary in the sum of ten thousand dollars was provided for; Comrade Clyde J. Wright was assigned as temporary State Secretary to the state of Nebraska under direction of the National Office; provisions were made for the issuance of a booklet on naturalization laws; appointed the last Sunday in February as a special day for propaganda in behalf of women, and recommended that the like subject be made a feature at the May Day celebrations.

DURING 1909—January 22d—Reports received from the committees on the special subjects assigned at the December session; a booklet was issued covering these subjects, entitled "Organization and Agitation—Ways and Means"; arrangements were made for the publication of Weekly Lessons and the Rand School was commissioned to prepare the same. Twenty-six Weekly Lessons have since been published in thirty-three party papers, beginning November 6, 1909, and ending April 30, 1910. The aggregate circulation of these papers closely approximate 500,000 copies.

April 9th—A Washington News Service was established for the period during the session of Congress, with Comrade Fred H. Merrick in charge; plans were made for more effective Socialist propaganda among the organized workers.

July 23d—Arranged for the publication of a booklet on Socialism and Trade Unionism; reporters were appointed and subjects assigned for discussion at the Party Congress; Representations to the International Socialist Bureau were made, accompanied with a claim for an additional secretary, and Comrade Berger was authorized to attend the session of the Bureau, November 6-8, at Brussels, Belgium.

December 11th—Principally occupied by the consideration of special propaganda for organized workers; provided for a call for nominations for delegates to the International Congress; the last Sunday in February was again set aside for special propaganda among women.

DURING 1910: April 9th—Decided to use fewer national organizers and give particular attention to a campaign of literature; sufficient interest being manifested in the Weekly Lessons on Socialism it was decided to publish the same in booklet form. The National Secretary was authorized to issue leaflets on all important events in the labor movement or in public life; the bond for the National Secretary was reduced to five thousand dollars. Further arrangements were made for the Congress.

Aside from the actions taken at the meetings, the members of the National Executive Committee are in almost constant correspondence and considering motions submitted by correspondence.

Special appeals or notices in the Bulletin or Party Press have frequently been authorized in behalf of various papers published in the foreign languages, likewise in support of other worthy purposes.

Cash appropriations or per diem allowances to organizers were from time to time granted to assist the weaker states; to meet special conditions in a given locality, or to aid struggling foreign speaking organizations, as follows:

New Hampshire, \$125; Slovenians, \$60; Florida, \$60; Wisconsin, \$84; Bohemians, \$98.18; Vermont, \$30; Kentucky, \$60; Alabama, \$100; Croatians, \$120; Lettish, 41.61; Spanish, \$90; Louisiana, \$60; Omaha, Neb., \$50; Polish, \$200; Pennsylvania, \$60; Oklahoma, \$180; West Virginia, \$60; Neues Leben (German paper), \$300. A special daily edition of the New York Call authorized during the Philadelphia general

strike at an expense of \$250; for the defense of Comrade Freeman Knowles, \$200, and for the defense of the New Castle (Pa.) Free Press, \$25.

PARTY ORGANIZATION.

Within the scope of this document I have to report that in thirty-nine states or territories organizations existed in the sense of maintaining state organizations on January 1, 1907, with about 1,900 affiliated locals. The party membership numbered 26,784. At the present time there are forty-two organized states with more than 3,200 affiliated locals and branches; this leaves the following states unorganized: Delaware, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia, and prospects are bright for bringing several of these into the organized column in the near future. In the interim locals or members at large have been attached to the National organization in Hawaii, Alaska, South America, Cuba, Porto Rico, Mexico, South Sea Islands, the Panama Canal zone and the Philippines. The dues paid during the past four months represent a membership of 53,375.

FINANCES.

RECEIPTS.

(From 1907 to April 30, 1910, inclusive.)

	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.	Total.
Amount Forward	\$ 117.58
Dues	\$ 17,763.45	\$ 25,534.01	\$ 25,154.31	\$ 10,645.01	79,096.78
Supplies	1,131.64	2,528.13	1,145.07	265.86	5,070.70
Literature	1,414.06	5,980.58	1,714.36	1,350.23	10,459.23
Buttons	560.42	1,079.59	706.21	305.64	2,651.86
W. F. Miners' Def. Fund	10,810.48	1,003.88	11,814.36
Nat. Campaign Fun.....	113.52	4,043.74	215.39	36.25	4,408.90
Russian S. D. L. P. Fund	644.33	644.33
One Day Wage Fund...	45.65	45.65
Nat. Org. Fund.....	1,218.86	1,218.86
Sub. D. Soc. & N. Y. Call	233.50	90.50	115.25	12.75	452.00
Red Special Fund.....	41,213.80	41,213.80
Refund and R. R. Fare on Red Special.....	649.36	649.36
Delegate mileage	610.65	610.65
Red Special loans.....	3,100.00	3,100.00
Mileage assessment	8,929.41	72.50	9,001.91
Political Fefugee Fund..	354.51	2.00	356.51
Italy Earthquake Fund..	74.20	74.20
Minnesota Primary Law	162.28	2.00	164.28
Swedish Strikers' Fund..	6,318.91	302.43	6,621.34
Spanish Prisoners' Fund	305.35	11.20	316.55
Milwaukee Cam. Fund..	576.88	576.88
Miscellaneous	162.91	174.48	47.30	.63	385.32
Total	\$ 34,098.82	\$ 94,938.13	\$ 36,313.14	\$ 13,583.38	\$ 179,051.05

EXPENSES.

(From 1907 to April 30, 1910, inclusive.)

	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.	Total.
Exchange	\$ 33.79	\$ 94.84	\$ 48.15	\$ 22.36	\$ 199.14
General expenses	77.72	314.60	196.43	70.57	659.32
Express and freight.....	229.71	1,733.29	539.53	447.46	2,949.99
Postage	1,439.51	3,535.53	2,290.78	924.04	8,189.86
Telegrams and phone.....	117.68	579.44	228.96	149.33	1,075.41
Office rent	1,150.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	400.00	3,950.00
Literature	828.56	2,764.78	1,092.93	383.94	5,070.21
Printing Bulletin.....	1,263.50	1,959.40	1,442.40	437.73	5,103.03
Printing and supplies.....	2,983.87	9,389.63	2,154.14	1,019.43	15,547.07
Lighting	115.32	96.41	211.73
Office equipment	76.70	1,186.84	28.90	17.52	1,309.96

N. E. C. meetings.....	630.95	881.50	1,040.10	364.00	1,916.55
Wages	5,568.27	10,071.95	6,324.00	2,248.50	24,212.72
Speakers	5,073.94	10,308.95	7,069.33	2,711.52	25,163.74
W. F. Miners' Def.....	10,810.48	1,003.88	11,814.36
Russian S. D. L. P.....	644.33	644.33
Stationery, etc.	278.11	674.08	418.54	203.35	1,574.08
Party buttons	705.82	1,393.40	960.05	142.44	3,201.71
Chicago Daily Soc.....	700.00	203.02	903.02
Plate matter, etc.....	429.55	429.55
Red Special	34,188.75	34,188.75
New York Call.....	500.00	500.00	1,000.00
Delegate mileage	7,910.73	7,910.73
Reporting Con. Proc'd'gs	924.75	924.75
Pepayment Red Sp. loans	3,100.00	3,100.00
Italy Earthquake Fund and Spanish prisoners	379.55	11.20	390.75
Political Refugee Fund.....	354.51	2.00	356.51
Minnesota Primary Law.....	150.00	50.00	200.00
Washington News Service	480.00	480.00
Neues Leben	300.00	300.00
Swedish Strikers' Fund	6,318.91	302.43	6,621.34
Milwaukee Cam. Fund.....	576.88	576.88
Reserve Mileage Fund	2,110.30	1,064.45	3,174.75
Miscellaneous	922.67	649.45	1,021.04	756.95	3,350.11
Total	\$ 33,650.93	\$ 95,094.77	\$ 36,648.55	\$ 12,306.10	\$ 177,700.35
Balance	1,350.70

May 1, 1910.....	\$ 179,051.05
Reserve Mileage Fund.....	\$ 3,174.75
Advance paid to delegates.....	605.50
Balance, Reserve Mileage Fund.....	\$ 2,569.25

ASSETS.	
On hand, May 10th.....	\$ 3,252.96
Accounts outstanding, locals, states, etc.....	386.50
Literature in stock.....	3,290.62
Party buttons	470.61
Supplies, stationery, account books, etc.....	540.94
Office furniture and fixtures.....	1,497.60
Sub. cards, Daily Socialist.....	167.25
Sub. cards, New York Call.....	991.00
Total assets	\$ 10,597.48

LIABILITIES.	
Owe Organizers—	
John M. Collins	\$ 68.35
Lena Morrow Lewis	260.19
Anna A. Maley	345.86
John M. Work	406.22
C. J. Wright	4.00
.....	\$ 1,084.62
H. G. Adair	12.00
H. G. Adair Printing Company	130.00
Bowman Automatic Addressing Company	15.52
Brotherhood Publishing Company	2.40
Central Printing and Engraving Company	150.00
Consolidated Press Clipping Company	10.02
A. B. Dick Company	10.50
M. Fry & Co.	41.55
Fox Typewriter Company80

Frederick Gummi	7.50
John F. Jordan	10.00
Levytype Company	7.50
James H. O'Neil	60.00
P. F. Pettibone & Co.	39.40
Progressive Woman	3.00
Radnicka Straza	18.00
Saul Brothers	21.50
L. C. Smith Typewriter Company	8.90
Underwood Typewriter Company	37.75
Wilshire Book Company	100.37
Total liabilities	\$ 1,771.33
Balance net resources.....	8,826.15
.....	\$ 10,597.48

RECEIPTS FOR DUES FOR FOUR MONTHS—JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH AND APRIL; YEARS, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910.

States—	1907	1908	1909	1910
Alabama	\$ 20.00	\$ 41.50	\$ 48.50	\$ 22.00
Arizona	60.00	48.00	65.00	50.20
Arkansas	75.00	160.00	95.00	78.00
Alaska	13.40	1.50	13.20
California	344.87	480.00	525.00	295.00
Colorado	99.00	196.00	181.75	112.80
Connecticut	100.00	86.50	130.00	96.50
Delaware	10.00	10.00
Florida	29.00	38.00	37.50
Georgia	13.30	8.00	18.40	10.60
Hawaii	4.00	4.00	8.00
Idaho	55.65	129.25	111.10	81.65
Illinois	532.75	536.00	725.00	750.00
Indiana	122.25	161.10	199.65	199.50
Iowa	128.70	195.00	150.00	150.00
Kansas	140.00	295.00	228.00	260.00
Kentucky	32.00	35.00	55.00	34.00
Louisiana	22.50	60.00	45.00	55.00
Maine	52.00	58.35	59.00	73.00
Maryland	35.10	45.00	65.00	92.50
Massachusetts	340.35	378.50	518.20	575.70
Michigan	186.95	204.20	280.60	255.40
Minnesota	251.40	327.80	366.80	513.85
Mississippi	12.30	4.20	15.70	8.70
Missouri	200.00	326.00	257.80	300.00
Montana	97.95	165.05	93.85	114.90
Nebraska	30.40	83.50	88.70	60.00
Nevada	48.00	51.10	45.00	54.00
New Hampshire	26.10	41.90	51.50	76.50
New Jersey	250.00	200.00	250.00	400.00
New Mexico	26.70	41.25	40.00	26.00
New York	560.00	650.00	800.00	850.00
North Carolina	17.30	35.80	11.30	6.20
North Dakota	37.75	41.90	62.00
Ohio	316.55	362.50	518.85	523.00
Oklahoma	310.00	556.20	285.00	2,000.00
Oregon	159.00	216.50	200.70	165.15
Pennsylvania	553.12	440.40	648.35	750.20
Rhode Island	33.00	28.00	45.00	45.50
South Carolina	6.70	16.00
South Dakota	46.10	77.75	62.50	34.95
Tennessee	25.00	22.00	40.00	20.00

Texas	102.35	309.30	293.30	359.90
Utah	10.00	72.00	73.10	48.20
Vermont	12.00	7.00	9.95	11.95
Virginia	9.00	13.80	25.20	20.40
Washington	201.10	318.70	144.50	234.00
West Virginia	27.50	35.50	35.00	40.00
Wisconsin	396.40	391.55	409.05	481.10
Wyoming	33.60	130.70	108.31	138.01
Panama	4.50	1.10
Porto Rico	6.10	27.20	25.40
Members at large	19.00	22.85
Washington, D. C.
Total	\$6,144.89	\$8,147.25	\$8,536.51	\$10,645.01

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN.

In the intervening general election it may be said with deliberation that no previous equal number of years were freighted with a like amount of agitation as that which was compressed within a few months during the presidential campaign. Scarcely a citizen of the nation this day can plead ignorance of the fact that there was a working class political platform and a fitting candidate in the race for the White House in the year 1908.

The files of the public press of the time will show scarcely an exception as to notices of these facts, while column upon column were devoted by many publications of wide circulation, not to mention numerous articles relating to incidents of the campaign which appeared in the magazines and more pretentious periodicals.

The campaign resulted in more than agitation as defined by the commonplace of "attracting attention"—it also produced votes, though this fact may not appear at first glance upon the figures of the returns. It must be remembered that the alleged radical democratic candidate was making his last stand and rallied to his support those entertaining a last hope under capitalism.

Besides, the American Federation of Labor, through its Executive Council, at this time first entered a national campaign as a partisan, having endorsed the Democratic ticket, and the president of the organization was engaged in an active campaign in support of that party.

The elements and issues in the last and the preceding campaigns can hardly be compared; scarcely a single condition is found common to both. The conservative Democratic candidate, the boom times (prosperity?), the wide-spread strikes and the industrial unrest of the former, as against Bryan; the acute period of the panic, the general conditions of unemployment; the vast number of workers lacking residents' qualifications; the threat of the master—job-owning—class—all these in the latter campaign tended to reduce the Socialist vote and make conservatism for the time being the normal trend.

Lacking proof we need not assert, but there is every reason to suspect that a very much larger Socialist vote was cast than that which was counted. However, on this point we have no cause to complain. The mere thought carries with it the proper lesson of organization. We must not only be valiant in declarations in opposition to capitalism, but must show that resolution, vigor and earnestness of purpose of degree necessary to make each single vote that is cast an additional vote in the count.

For the purpose of permanent record a comparative table of the Socialist votes is here presented:

SOCIALIST PARTY VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES 1900-1908.

	1900	1902	1904	1906	1908
Alabama	928	2,312	1,853	389	1,399
Arkansas	27	1,816	2,164	5,842
California	7,572	9,592	29,533	17,515	28,659
Colorado	684	7,177	4,304	16,938	7,974
Connecticut	1,029	2,804	4,543	3,005	5,113
Delaware	57	146	149	240

Florida	603	2,337	2,530	3,747
Georgia	1,567	197	98	584
Idaho	9,687	20,167	42,005	6,400
Illinois	2,374	7,111	12,013	7,824	34,711
Indiana	2,742	6,360	14,847	8,901	8,287
Iowa	1,605	4,078	15,494	8,796	12,420
Kansas	770	1,683	3,602	1,819	4,185
Kentucky	995	603	2,538	2,538
Louisiana	878	1,973	2,106	1,553	1,758
Maine	908	499	2,247	3,106	2,323
Maryland	9,716	33,629	13,604	20,699	10,781
Massachusetts	2,826	4,271	8,941	5,994	11,586
Michigan	3,065	5,143	11,692	14,445	14,527
Minnesota	393	173	978	978
Mississippi	6,128	5,335	13,009	11,528	15,431
Missouri	708	3,131	5,676	4,638	5,855
Montana	823	3,157	7,412	3,763	3,524
Nebraska	925	1,251	2,103	2,103
Nevada	790	1,057	1,090	1,011	1,299
New Hampshire	4,609	4,541	9,587	7,766	10,249
New Jersey	12,869	23,400	36,883	25,948	38,451
New York	124	345	345
North Carolina	518	1,245	2,017	1,689	2,421
North Dakota	4,847	14,270	36,260	18,432	33,795
Ohio	815	1,963	4,443	4,040	21,779
Oklahoma	1,495	3,771	7,651	17,033	7,339
Oregon	4,831	21,910	21,863	18,736	33,913
Pennsylvania	956	416	1,365	1,365
Rhode Island	169	2,738	3,138	2,542	2,846
South Carolina	410	1,354	1,637	1,870
Tennessee	1,846	3,615	2,791	3,065	7,870
Texas	717	3,069	5,767	3,010	4,895
Utah	371	844	512	547
Vermont	145	155	218	255
Virginia	2,006	4,739	10,023	8,717	14,177
Washington	268	1,572	2,611	3,679
West Virginia	7,095	15,970	28,220	24,916	28,164
Wisconsin	552	1,077	1,827	1,715
Wyoming
Territories—
Arizona	510	1,304	1,995	1,912	1,912
New Mexico	162	211	1,056	1,056
Totals	96,931	223,494	409,230	331,043	424,483

THE SOCIALIST PRESS.

As previously stated, publications which support the party are entitled to the highest praise for assistance rendered. Almost without exception they have given liberal space to official communications and earnestly co-operated in the work of organization.

In the last year the government officials seemed disposed to harrass the Socialist and liberal press by imposing impossible postal regulations upon financially weak publications. It would seem that the current protest has turned aside their resolutions. A portentous incident in this connection was the arrest of Comrade Fred D. Warren, editor of the Appeal, upon a federal warrant for having circulated an offer of a reward for the apprehension of ex-Governor Taylor of Kentucky, who at that time was a fugitive from justice under the charge of murder. Comrade Warren was convicted and a fine of \$1,500.00 and a sentence of six months in jail was imposed—this, in spite of the fact that the postmaster at Girard, Kansas, testified that he had passed with approval upon the document in question before it was mailed.

The act for which Comrade Warren was indicted was a coup, a counter-stroke

to join the issues squarely and try out the possibilities of alleged even-handed justice in the defense of the officials of the Western Federation of Miners, who had been kidnapped in Colorado and transported to Idaho.

In the interim between the lodgment of the charge against and the trial of Comrade Warren, a pardon was granted to ex-Governor Taylor and he appeared as the principal witness for the federal authorities.

It should be known that the records of the trial at Fort Scott would prove that Governor Taylor was never indicted, no charge was ever lodged against him, and consequently that he was never a fugitive from justice, although the whole world knows that the records are a lie.

Within the past few days Comrade Warren has appeared before the Court in St. Paul for a re-hearing, where he personally put up to the Court the question whether the kidnapping of a workingman is legal and the suggestion to kidnap a capitalist politician a crime. Information as to the outcome of the re-hearing is not at hand at this writing.

Relating further to the press, one of the dangers to the movement is the disposition of comrades, all unprepared, to launch a local publication, which in the very nature of things is frequently foredoomed to an early or certain demise.

The value of the two English daily papers to the American workingmen can surely not be over-estimated. The Chicago Daily Socialist, now less than four years old, and the New York Call, which has not yet rounded out its second year of existence, have nipped in the bud many a brutal scheme aimed at the working class. The flashlight of publicity and exposure have proven a very effective protection.

The value of the daily papers in the foreign language needs to be noted, also one distinctive feature about them, that is, while it is always necessary for a movement to precede the establishment of an English paper, a few foreign comrades, almost invariably with little or no organization behind them, started these papers and the papers have made and are making the respective movements.

SOCIALIST PAPERS ON THE EXCHANGE LIST OF THE NATIONAL OFFICE.

DAILY—(ENGLISH). Per Year.

"Chicago Daily Socialist".....	180 Washington St., Chicago, Ill.	\$3.00
"New York Call".....	409 Pearl St., New York City.....	3.00
"The Daily Register".....	Lead, S. D.	3.00

WEEKLY—(ENGLISH).

"Cotton's Weekly"	Cowansville, Quebec, Canada.....	.50
"The Lantern"	50 Van Buren St., Deadwood, S. D.	1.50
"The World"	523 17th St., Oakland, Cal.	1.00
"Common Sense"	649 E. Main St., Los Angeles, Cal.50
"Christian Socialist"	5623 Drexel Av., Chicago, Ill.50
"Appeal to Reason"	Girard, Kan.50
"The Oklahoma Socialist"	Duncan, Okla.	1.00
"Farmers' Journal"	Abilene, Texas25
"St. Louis Labor"	212 S. 4th St., St. Louis, Mo.	1.00
"Montana News"	Helena, Mont.50
"The Laborer"	401 Main St., Dallas, Tex.	1.00
"Toilers' Defense"	Cole Dale, Pa.	1.00
"Social Democratic Herald"	344 6th St., Milwaukee, Wis.50
"The Western Clarion"	Vancouver, British Columbia, Can.	1.00
"The Miners' Magazine"	605 Railroad Bldg., Denver, Colo.	1.00
"The Cleveland Citizen"	310 Champlain Av., N. W., Cleve- land, O.50
"The Pioneer"	Oklahoma City, Okla.50
"The Industrial Democrat"	Oklahoma City, Okla.50
"The Prolocutor"	Garden City, Kan.	1.00
"The Findlay Call"	Findlay, Ohio50
"Welch's Weekly"	Wichita, Kan.50
"Wilshire's Magazine"	200 William St., New York City....	.25
"International Socialist Review".....	118 E. Kinzie St., Chicago, Ill.	1.00

"The Comrade"	446 E. 7th St., Erie, Pa.50
"The Harp"	436 East 155th St., New York.....	.50
"Progressive Journal of Education".....	45 La Salle St., Chicago, Ill.50
"The Progressive Woman"	Girard, Kan.50
"The New Era"	184 S. High St., Columbus, O.25
"The Enterpriser"	Lincoln, Neb.15
"The Evolutionist"	180 Washington St., Chicago, Ill.75
"The Little Socialist"	15 Spruce St., New York City.....	.50
"The Free Press" (Bi-weekly)	P. O. Drawer 622, New Castle, Pa.50
"The World's Referee"	713 1st St., Seattle, Wash.50

DAILY—(FOREIGN).

(Bohemian)—"Spravedlnost"	679 Loomis St., Chicago, Ill.	\$4.00
(Bohemian)—"Americke Delincke Listy".....	4032 Broadway, Cleveland, O.	1.00
(German)—"Volks Zeitung"	15 Spruce St., New York City.....	6.00
(German)—"Tageblatt"	613 Callowhill St., Philadelphia, Pa.	3.00
(Jewish)—"Forward"	175 East Broadway, New York City	3.50
(Polish)—"Dziennik Ludowy"	959 Milwaukee Av., Chicago, Ill.	3.00

WEEKLY.

(German)—"Neues Leben"	180 Washington St., Chicago, Ill.	\$1.50
(German)—"Arbeiter Zeitung"	212 S. Fourth St., St. Louis, Mo.	2.00
(German)—"Vorwaerts"	15 Spruce St., New York City.....	1.00
(German)—"Die Wahrheit"	344 Sixth St., Milwaukee, Wis.	1.50
(Polish)—"Robotnick"	416 6th St., New York City.....	3.00
(Slovac)—"Rovnost Ludu"	679 Loomis St., Chicago, Ill.	1.25
(Slavonic)—"Proletaree"	2146 Blue Island Av., Chicago, Ill.	1.50
(Danish)—"Reyven"	2639 West North Av., Chicago, Ill.	1.00
(Italian)—"La Parola die Socialista".....	874 Blue Island Av., Chicago, Ill.	1.00
(Jewish)—"Labor World"	739 W. 12th St., Chicago, Ill.	1.00
(Finnish)—"Raivaaaja"	392 Main St., Fitchburg, Mass.	2.50
(Finnish)—"Toveri"	Tenth and Duane St., Astoria, Ore.	2.00
(Finnish)—"Tyomies Pub. Co."	Hancock, Mich.	2.75
(French)—"L'Union des Travailleurs"	Charleroi, Pa.	1.50
(Hungarian)—"Elore"	1528 Second Av., New York City...	1.00
(Lettish)—"Strahdneeks"	28 Broadway, South Boston, Mass.	3.00
(Lettish)—"Kova"	418 S. 2d St., Philadelphia, Pa.	2.00
(Norwegian)—"Gaa Paa"	415 Cedar Av., Minneapolis, Minn.50
(Croatian)—"Radnicka Straza"	1800 S. Center Av., Chicago, Ill.	1.00
(Jewish)—"Diezakunft" (The Future)	141 Division St., New York City...	1.00
(Russian)—"The Russian-American Worker" (Monthly)	208 McWhorter St., Newark, N. J.	1.00
(Swedish)—"Svenska Socialisten" (Semi- Monthly)	330 7th St., Rockford, Ill.50

Considerable might be said about the Rand School, located in New York, the Inter-collegiate Society, the Socialist Sunday Schools, the Finnish Socialist College at Smithville, Minn., and other lines of educational endeavor; but these subjects have either been extensively noted in the Official Monthly Bulletin, or will be brought to your attention in other documents presented during the course of the Congress.

INTERNATIONAL ACTION.

The relations between our party and the International Socialist Bureau and all its affiliated branches have been most pleasant, fraternal and cordial. All our publications of every kind and nature are regularly forwarded to the Bureau. Obedient to its initiative necessary information has been transmitted to every country as required, and such financial aid as was possible was extended upon call.

The international spirit of the Socialist Party of America and its recognition of class solidarity can probably best be shown by the following table of figures:

1907.	
Russian S. D. L. P. and Bloody Sunday Fund (at close).....	\$ 3,312.01
1908.	
W. F. of M. Defense Fund (at close).....	\$15,956.15
1909.	
Political Refugee Defense Fund.....	\$ 354.51
Italy Earthquake Fund.....	74.20
Swedish Strikers' Fund.....	6,318.91
Spanish Prisoners' Fund.....	305.35
Total	\$ 7,052.97

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS.

AGENDA AND ASSIGNMENTS:

1. Relations between co-operative organizations and the political parties. Should co-operative societies remain neutral, independent from the political organizations, attached to these by a personal bond, or should they be affiliated to the parties?

2. The question of unemployment. Upon this subject Comrade Hunter will make report.

3. Arbitration and disarmament. Affiliated parties should state what they have accomplished and what their hopes are in the matter of bringing this matter to the favorable attention of the working class.

4. International results of labor legislation. Upon this subject Comrade Berger will report.

5. Organization of an international manifestation against capital punishment.

6. Line to take up to insure speedy execution of resolutions passed at the International Congress. What procedure would you recommend in case of war threatening?

7. Organization of international solidarity. What is the best mode of collecting help in the case of serious struggle between capital and labor? How supply information to labor newspapers and prevent the press from injuring the movement by biased information?

Comrade Hillquit will report on the progress of the Socialist and Labor movements of America.

At the present time a membership referendum is in progress for the election of eight delegates to the Congress. Some provision should be made to cover their expenses, which will probably approximate the sum of \$2,500.00.

TRADE UNIONS.

As to the policy of the party toward trades unions or labor organizations little need be said except that its declarations in the last convention, and the later statements of the National Executive Committee are in entire accord with the resolution of the Stuttgart International Congress. That no enemy of our movement, using the texts thereof, can by any subterfuge set us in opposition to the organized labor movement, or discount our position before the whole working class. Unfortunately some of our members fly in the face of every Party declaration, the essentials of which are stated in the Stuttgart resolution, as follows:

"The unions and the party have equally an important part to perform in the struggle for proletarian emancipation. Each of the two organizations has its distinct domain, defined by its nature and within whose borders it should enjoy independent control of its line of action."

Again, there is a strong tendency on the part of some to show disappointment and resort to severe criticism because the organized labor forces have not, or do not, come *en masse* under the political standard of the working class. Account must be taken of the history and tendency of organized labor, its experience and accomplishments, and here as elsewhere, material interests are found to play their part.

In 1896, or fourteen years ago, organized labor in the United States numbered in its membership about 600,000 workers. These were mainly composed of shop men

—inside workers, such as printers, tailors, shoemakers, cigarmakers, horse shoers, bakers, molders, garment workers, etc. Most of these had fought their signal battle with the employers while competition was a factor in the industry during the previous decade. Relatively speaking, they have since stood still in membership and their later accomplishments in trade conditions are not to be compared with those secured in the earlier period.

Today, as against 1896, about 1,800,000 additional workers are enrolled in the various labor organizations. This addition is made up of builders and transportation workers—outside men, such as carmen, carpenters, masons, electricians, teamsters, miners, railroad employees, structural iron workers, etc. Many of the trades in this class had no organization whatsoever at the period first stated. About 70 per cent of the present labor movement is made up of these new men and new organizations. Their principal contents have been fought in these later years. Frequently an organization increased its membership enormously year after year and also reduced hours and increased its members' wages with almost equal regularity, amounting in wages in some cases to more than a hundred per cent within the period.

The former division—the older organizations—are susceptible to Socialist thought and the trend among them is more and more towards the recognition of class lines. There is a reason.

The latter division, comprising the newer organized workers, all unmindful of the rising prices of living, or any other consideration, are all attention and fully engaged in the near everyday fight, resulting to date in their material advancement under the present regime.

Our duty to all is plain, that is, to point out the insecurity and hideousness of capitalism; the injustice and iniquity of profit taking or any other form of robbery which takes from the toiling producer his just and full reward and provides the idler with the luxuries and the habiliments of power, unearned and undeserved.

FRANCHISE LIMITATIONS.

Two years ago the National Executive Committee promised aid to the Minnesota State Committee for making a legal contest upon the existing primary law and advised them to pay the fees demanded only under protest. In the month of April, 1909, the National Committee took similar action and guaranteed one-third of the total expense; providing further that the states should proportionately share the amount and reimburse the National Office, but only about half of the states responded.

Comrade Nash, State Secretary of Minnesota, under date of April 22, 1910, writes as follows:

"At the last meeting of the Executive Board I was instructed to ask you to make another call for assistance in taking the Filing Fee Case to the United States Supreme Court. The case has been decided against us in the State Supreme Court, but that is about what I expected. It may be foolish to spend any more money on the case, but I believe we had better put the thing through now, as it will either result in giving us the case or else fix things where other states will know better than to waste any more money in fighting the Class Courts."

Although there are about a dozen states somewhat similarly affected, the party as a whole is committed to financing and fighting this specific and flagrant case of class legislation. This case was selected as the best among many to be carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the benefit of a successful issue will be advantageous to each and every organization. Some further financial provision should be made to relieve this state of its disproportionate share of the burden. As arrangements now stand it is committed to meet two-thirds of the total expense.

IN MEMORIAM

Since our last meeting two valiant workers have ceased from their labors and gone to rest. Both had been long in the service of the Party and exerted the most capable efforts of their lives in its behalf. It is with profound regret that I must needs make record here of the death of Comrade M. W. Wilkins, on January 18, 1910. He was a delegate to the 1904 convention and one of the oldest in point of service and one of the best known national organizers. And also the death of Comrade Ben Hanford on January 24, 1910. He was a delegate to the 1904 and 1908 conventions and at each was chosen as the candidate of the party for Vice-President. His later

years' struggles with illness, while giving the full measure of his waning energies in service to his class, was martyrdom almost unequalled and will remain as an example and an inspiration to thousands of comrades in the years to come.

FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

I sincerely hope that the long deferred action will be taken or rather that a proper solution of the question concerning foreign speaking organizations, will be found and applied. It is necessary that each be placed upon an equitable basis and have their proper relations to the national organization clearly defined. However, this question will arise in your midst as a result of a conference of the delegates of the foreign speaking organizations held in this city May 13th and 14th. I bespeak for their proposal a careful and serious consideration to the end that unity and harmony may be promoted throughout the entire movement.

Considering the many trying situations lately confronting all branches of the party in the matter of electing delegates, caused by the recent National Party Referendum upon the question of holding this Congress, and upon which the vote closed April 6th, I would suggest the adoption of a constitutional provision preventing the possible recurrence of such a situation. A certain month, long enough in advance, might be designated in which to elect all delegates, or a constitutional prohibition be imposed against the introducing of a referendum effecting the time of the Congress or Convention after a certain date.

This document might be indefinitely increased in length by the consideration of such other topics as organization, propaganda, organization among women, etc., but reporters will open these subjects before you and the various standing committees are due to maintain the policy of the "open door" for suggestions from any source.

And in the course of events in the American Socialist movement a National Party Congress has been evolved.

Comrade delegates, as the chosen representatives of the working class political movement of America, a great honor, responsibility and opportunity rests with you.

The present year ends the first decade of the Twentieth Century. This century and its possible accomplishments, through generations, has been the ideal of the savant, the theme of the poet and the hope of the sons of toil.

Our purpose and program is clear; to reserve to labor the value it creates. There is no deep and hidden philosophy in the just demand; no reward without labor, no labor without full reward. Better still, our class has the power, the strength of numbers to impose these conditions on the very day it elects so to do.

It is for you representatives, here and now, to make our organization so compact, so disciplined, so responsive, that when the order is to move the foot fall of the nearest and farthest removed comrade will sound in unison.

The number of enrolled party members, the active sympathizers and voters of the Socialist ticket is a host to reckon with. The more intelligent and malignant opponents understand this quite well, and by subtle and subterranean means are trying to halt our progress and divide and dismember our present forces.

They have an impossible task before them. Day by day in the marts of trade, in the halls of legislation, in the whole varied field of industry they prove anew their dishonesty and incompetency and goad the workers to think, and press them ever nearer the point of revolt.

The Socialist movement of the world has raised the standard—for working class rule—and supplemented economic class action with political action.

The vulnerable spot in the armor of capitalism has been disclosed. The capitalists make and interpret the laws for themselves. The American division of the international movement—its conscious working class—has brighter prospects and more assurance of success than ever. It turns its face towards Washington to punish its enemies and to reward itself, with laws made for labor by

Fraternally submitted,
J. MAHLON BARNES,
National Secretary.

The motion was then put and carried.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): While we are waiting for the tellers, may I have a word?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will welcome it.

DEL. COLLINS: The question I want to have a word on is this question of the right of suffrage. I want to say that while I was brought up in a home where from the earliest days—my father would have been about ninety if he were alive—that was in favor of woman suffrage, I never have heard a fundamental reason why we have the right to suffrage, why a woman or a man has a fundamental right to suffrage. I have never heard a woman suffragist explain that. It will only take me a moment to make my point. Women claim the right to suffrage and I was brought up to believe in it. Now I do believe the Socialist Party should go on record as claiming that right of suffrage from some definite viewpoint that makes it right or wrong to have it.

Delegate Lewis reported for the tellers that the following delegates were elected to serve on the Committee on Constitution: Gaylord, 77 votes; Work, 75 votes; Collins, 67 votes; Reynolds, 66 votes; Wilson, 67 votes; DeBell, 62 votes; Goebel, 61 votes; Lowe, 64 votes; and a tie vote between delegates Bloor and Carpenter, 53 votes; that the remaining votes were as follows: Kumperfeld, 50 votes; Moore, 50 votes; Bell, 31 votes; Morgan, 35 votes.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I move that we accept the report of the tellers and proceed by show of hands to choose between the two comrades, who are tied in the vote for ninth place.

Upon a show of hands Delegate Bloor was declared elected as the ninth member of the committee.

The Congress then adjourned to Monday morning, May 16, 1910, at 9:30.

SECOND DAY'S SESSION.

The Congress was called to order at 9:30 A. M. by Secretary Roewer.

Nominations for Chairman were called for. Delegate Untermann moved that Delegate Hillquit be elected permanent Chairman of the Congress. The motion was not entertained.

Delegate James F. Carey, of Massachusetts, was then chosen as Chairman for the day.

Reading Clerk Strelb proceeded to read the minutes of the previous day. Delegate Thompson moved, that in-

asmuch as the minutes were in printed form, the reading be dispensed with and the delegates be given an opportunity to make such corrections as were necessary. The motion carried.

Delegate Hillquit announced that the International Secretaries were not ready to report at this time, and asked leave to report to-morrow. Request granted.

REPORT ON ORGANIZATION.

Delegate John M. Work then read the report on organization, as follows:

REPORT ON ORGANIZATION.

To the National Congress of the Socialist Party:

The first essential of an effective organization is that its members shall possess high character. Most of the members of the Socialist Party have that qualification. The cause suffers injury from those who do not. It is the duty of each member, by word and action, to be a standing recommendation for the cause. Where the active members are men and women who are upright, trustworthy, broad-minded, attractive, tolerant, optimistic and aggressive, other things being equal, the movement is making good progress. Where the active members are booze-fighters, or all-around repellent grouchers, or unclean persons, or unreliable persons, or persons who lack aggressiveness, or religious bigots, or anti-religious bigots, the movement is standing still. One is not justified in being a sour misanthrope just because the human race has not yet developed to the stage to which it will develop. In so far as comrades have not yet attained the above mentioned desirable qualifications for membership, they can do the cause a distinct service by developing those qualities.

The problems of local organization are many and very important. In that field we can only suggest. The pamphlet issued by the National Executive Committee entitled, "Organization and Agitation, Ways and Means," contains an abundance of valuable suggestions for local work. I refer all inquirers about local organization to that pamphlet. There is need, not of more suggestions along that line, but rather of more devoted workers to carry them out.

The recommending of amendments to our national constitution falls peculiarly within the scope of this report. I shall reduce all my recommendations to that form.

Our party pledge, set out in the constitution, contains an inaccuracy which should be corrected. The term "propertied classes" should be changed to "capitalist class," because the former statement is obviously inaccurate. The capitalist class may consist of sub-classes, but the term is accurate, just the same.

Persons who are indifferent toward political action, as well as those who oppose it, have no right to be members of the Socialist Party. Such persons should voluntarily leave the organization. If they do not, they should be expelled.

The terms of all national committeemen should begin and expire at the same time. To accomplish this, the states should be required to desist from calling for nominations for national committeemen until after the National Secretary announces the number to which each state is entitled.

The terms of national committeemen should be extended two years, in order to conform to the terms of the other national officers.

The time has gone by when we need to prevent the National Committee from publishing any official organ. It may or may not be advisable to do so, but in my opinion the way should be left open.

In the election of national officers, it is highly desirable that the names of candidates be rotated on the ballot. Otherwise, those whose names commence with letters near the beginning of the alphabet have an unfair advantage. And if the next highest in such elections are permitted to fill vacancies, it may save a great deal of trouble and expense in holding special elections.

The preferential ballot is the only fair system of electing party officials. For the first time we now have a National Executive Committee which is the absolute choice of the membership. The result of the election disproves every assertion that was made against the system. But, I do not reintroduce the system at this time, for the reason that the membership has recently voted it down. It takes time for even a Socialist to discard conservatism and get ready to adopt a new idea.

It is a fair division of authority for the National Secretary to have the power to appoint assistants in the national office and for the National Executive Committee or the National Committee to have power to discharge them if they see fit. In this manner it is assured that the employees will not be personally disagreeable to the National Secretary, but will be persons with whom he can work harmoniously, and at the same time he will not have absolute control in the matter.

Heretofore, organization has been the most important work of the national office. That phase of the work becomes less and less important as the states become more and more able to look after their own organization work. But, for some time, the national office will still have a large field to cover in assisting the weak states to reach the self-sustaining point.

The need of national lecturers also becomes less and less, as the states become more and more able to put lecturers in the field themselves. But the national office should not be entirely shorn of its power to tour lecturers. There will be special cases where it ought to do so, both with home talent and lecturers from other countries. In such cases, with the exception of the special trade union lecturers, there is no need of the lecturer being an expense to the office. The terms can just as well as not be made high enough to pay out, or even to be a source of income.

In the Weekly Bulletin, the Monthly Bulletin, the monthly financial statements, and the annual reports, organizing and lecture tours should be distinguished from each other. Lecturers are constantly criticized for not organizing. This is simply because they are constantly called organizers instead of lecturers. At any given time, a field worker's province is either predominantly lecturing or predominantly organizing. It is not difficult to make the distinction.

This distinction is also needed for the benefit of the organizers and for the good of the organization. The table of results obtained by organizers, published in annual reports, should make this distinction. It should also state the total number of members added to the Party by each organizer, as well as the number of locals. Otherwise, the organizer has a full blown incentive to organize locals where the conditions are not ripe, because he knows that his success as an organizer will be judged by the number of locals he organizes. In many instances, a local is organized where the conditions are not ripe. As a result, it lapses and throws a pall of discouragement upon the comrades of the vicinity. That depressing effect should be avoided. It can be avoided by organizing a member-at-large community, with one member as secretary to collect and send in dues for all. Then let it grow into a local naturally. But this is not likely to be done to any great extent so long as organizers are judged by the number of locals they organize.

We need to establish a closer bond of co-operation between the organization and the Socialist papers and magazines. The Socialist publications should make both their columns and their subscription lists more valuable for organization purposes by running an organization department as a regular feature, presenting the matter in such a way that locals will always have full meetings and Socialists outside of the organization will be eager to join. On the other hand, all field workers should be required to handle the subscription cards of those publications, and those only.

It is high time for us to begin to hold annual conventions. There is nothing like personal contact to clear up misunderstandings, to infuse enthusiasm into the move-

ment, and to keep the principles, policies and machinery of the movement up-to-date, so that it will always fit the conditions and not have to bear the weight of cumbrous useless matter. Such results will vastly more than repay the expense. And, on account of the increasing membership, the expense can be paid out of the regular income of the Party, without any special assessments. There is no need to confuse matters by calling some of these meetings congresses and others conventions. They should all be called conventions. There should not be any requirement for reports to be printed in advance. It is entirely impracticable to do so. We will get more complete and mature reports if we strike out that provision. It is an utter waste of hundreds of dollars of the Party's money to report and print the speeches made in conventions in permanent form.

It is a great mistake to try to limit a national convention beforehand to a certain number of days. It should take time to do its work with deliberation. Otherwise, this most important work of the Party will be done by peevish and irritable delegates who are below normal mentally because of loss of sleep.

There has hitherto been no guiding rule as to what proceedings of national conventions shall be submitted to referendum. This should be defined. Everything sent to referendum should go in such a way that the membership can vote upon it piecemeal.

It should be remembered that all portions of the national constitution stand in force until repealed by the membership. It is therefore impossible for a national convention to simply adopt an entire new constitution and send it to referendum. If it did so, all sections not specifically replaced would remain in force.

It should be made entirely possible for a minority of the delegates to have alternative amendments or other alternative propositions submitted to referendum at the same time, so that the membership may take its choice of all phases of such matters, and not be confined to the necessity of merely voting for or against one phase.

Recent experience has demonstrated that the present requirements for the initiation of referendums are too low. The number of locals necessary to initiate should be increased. All initiations should be held and sent out at one time in each year, to save expense, unless they are of such great importance that a still larger number of locals initiate them. The provision which allows three big locals to initiate referendums should be struck out. No three locals, however large, should have such power.

Many comrades have deplored the fact that our members have to spend so much time and energy on the party machinery, thus decreasing the amount of time and energy spent on propaganda. I am convinced that this is largely due to the use of dues stamps and stated local dues. In my opinion we should abolish the use of dues stamps altogether. Also, that we should depend upon voluntary contributions for local purposes instead of local dues. We get a very small percentage of our funds from dues. Most of our funds are raised by voluntary contributions at the present time. They should all be raised that way. The financial criterion of good standing in the Party is not the right one. I once organized a local composed of striking coal miners. There were a dozen strikers in the room who wanted to join, but could not, because they were on strike and therefore did not have the money to pay the dues. I had to bar them out of the Socialist Party literally because they were engaged in a grim economic battle in the class struggle! It should be made easy, not hard, for such stern soldiers of the class war to get into the Socialist Movement, where they belong. A great many other examples could be presented to illustrate the fact that the financial criterion of good standing in the Party is not right. It should be abolished just as nearly as possible. So far as the state and national organizations are concerned, it is impracticable to abolish it, because they are not directly in contact with the membership like the locals are. But it can with great profit be abolished so far as the locals and members-at-large are concerned. A member should be considered in good standing so long as he is performing the proper functions of a member, regardless of his financial condition. At the first of each year the local should circulate a subscription list among the members and let each subscribe whatever amount per month he feels able to subscribe for the ensuing year, or none at all if he is unable to. This would relieve local officials from the entire dues stamp nuisance. It would also relieve the Party members of the feeling that their good standing in the Party depended upon cash payment. And, last but not least, it would raise a great deal more money. The local should go through its list periodically and strike from

the roll those who have transferred to other locals, those who have changed their place of citizenship without transferring, and those who do not do anything for the cause, or who for any other reason have forfeited the right to be members. All others should be considered in good standing, no matter whether their subscriptions are paid or not. They should have perfect liberty to increase, decrease, or withdraw their subscriptions at any time. The dues paid by the local to the state should be a sum equal to twenty-five cents for each member. This will be feasible because it is so much easier to raise money by voluntary contributions than by stated local dues. There will then be money enough in the state treasury to do something. And there will then be TIME for the state secretaries to do something, because they will be released from having to spend most of their time fooling with dues stamps. State constitutions should contain provisions for remitting local dues when local circumstances make it advisable.

In case the recommendations contained in the foregoing paragraph are too revolutionary to be adopted by this Congress, we ought to have some method of furnishing dues stamps to distressed and unemployed members, without payment by them, and also without placing the burden upon the local or state organizations. If the national organization furnishes such stamps, they will cost nothing except the trifling amount paid for printing them. They should be identical with all the other dues stamps, so that there will be no taint of charity attached to them. And the provision concerning them should be worded so that women without separate income can take advantage of it if they so desire.

The provision for referendum of states in case of controversy over the title of state officers is unworkable. It would be quite impossible to decide whether the signatures on a petition filed under that provision were bona fide, without going to enormous expense. In the cases that have arisen, it has been found impossible of application. In those cases, other methods have been used. The provision should be struck out.

In the only case where the National Office has appointed a temporary state secretary for an unorganized state, he was not taken from the section in which the state was located. The results were eminently successful. I see no reason why we should bind ourselves to take such secretaries from the section in which the state is located. The thing is to get the right secretary, one who has the ability and understands the field. A comrade may be thoroughly familiar with the state and yet be living hundreds of miles away from it at the present time. That clause should be struck out.

The state organizations that have arrived at the stage where they are able to avail themselves of the full time and services of a state secretary and a state organizer are in a position to do good work and make constant progress. The states that have not arrived at that stage are in a crippled condition. It should be their aim to reach that stage as soon as possible. Special state organizing funds can be used to good advantage for that purpose. And the change from the stated local dues to voluntary contributions will make it so much easier to raise funds that the state dues can be raised to twenty-five cents per member.

The National Office should also lend a hand in order to help to put all weak states in the desirable position of being able to avail themselves of the full time of a state secretary and a state organizer. Instead of giving direct financial assistance to weak states, it should be the policy of the National Office to assign national organizers to the weak states until the membership is increased to the point where, with twenty-five cent dues, the state will be self-supporting as above described. Of course the National Office must be allowed to use discretion as to when the time is ripe for such work in any state. When the state secretary is incompetent, it is a fruitless expense to send an organizer to that state, for his work will lapse as soon as he leaves.

The sets of account books now furnished by the National Office for the use of state and local organizations are too intricate. They require an infinity of needless detail. They should be replaced by sets of books based upon the most simple plan that can be devised.

It is senseless to have two financial officers in a local or branch, one drawing warrants upon the other. The fact of having two secretaries is a constant source of confusion. The office of local or branch organizer is a misnomer. As a rule, his duties do not consist of organizing at all. This also causes constant confusion and misunderstanding, especially in organizing new locals, the charter members of which

are unaffected and naive enough to expect things to be called by their right names. To abolish these confusions and secure uniformity, the local and branch officers should be designated in the national constitution.

Regarding the methods to be used by national organizers for the purpose of placing weak states on their feet, and also by state organizers, I will refer you to my report on Organization published in the pamphlet entitled "Organization and Agitation, Ways and Means." In that report I went into the subject of field organizing in detail, and I need not repeat it here. As for the methods therein set forth, I have used them with a high degree of success in several states, adapting them to the territory. They are capable of being adapted to any state in the Union.

Our national constitution is silent on the subject of international secretaries. They should be provided for and the method of selecting them should be defined. They should be elected by the membership.

There are a great many places where our candidates for public office are not required to sign blank resignations. Even though we run the chances of such resignations being declared null and void by the capitalist courts, the signing of them should be made compulsory, because of their moral effect. But, the membership alone should decide when such resignations shall be filled out and filed. That is entirely too dangerous a power to entrust to any committee.

Our national constitution is also silent on the subject of the Woman's National Committee. Certainly this committee should be provided for in the constitution, and not remain a mere adjunct. Woman has been an adjunct long enough. This committee should be elected by the membership, the same as the other national officers. It should consist exclusively of women. And any plans on which such committee and the National Executive Committee concur should be carried out at the expense of the National Office. In my judgment there should be a woman's department in the National Office. The manager of this department should be a woman and should be a regular employee of the National Office, appointed by the National Secretary with the approval of the Woman's National Committee.

Wherever practicable, candidates for public office should be nominated by referendum vote. It is completely feasible to nominate our candidates for president and vice-president in that manner. It will not only be the proper method of nominating, but it will vastly increase the usefulness of national conventions held in presidential years. They are now largely ruined by the fact that they have such candidates to select.

Our Party ought in my opinion to enter upon the hitherto unattempted work of looking after the physical welfare of its members, and of the working class in general so far as it can. The ignorance on this subject is almost as dense among our members as among others. We need to put competent persons in the field to give both theoretical and practical lectures on health, hygiene, sanitation, physical development, etc., and to instruct classes in these subjects. Eventually, our locals need to secure competent Socialist physicians to care for the health and physical development of all the members, each member's regular contributions to the physician's salary to cease while he or any member of his family is not in good health. The physician will then have a decided financial incentive to keep all the members in good health, instead of a decided financial incentive to keep the people sick, as the physicians have now. All locals that are strong enough should adopt this plan at once. Our reasoning that Socialism is inevitable on account of industrial evolution will not be flawless unless we take advantage of all sensible means of preventing the physical and mental deterioration of the working class. A thoroughly healthy man is a thoroughly poised man. He is to be depended upon in a crisis and also at all other times. The capitalist system bristles with weapons to strike down physical health. So much the greater necessity that we should oppose that tendency as vigorously as possible. Under the mentally stifling pressure of capitalism, millions of people are constantly poisoning themselves, depleting their brain power, and destroying their resisting power, by the use of liquor, tobacco, patent medicines, confectionery, soda counter abominations, unwholesome diet, excessive sexual intercourse, lack of ventilation, unsanitary homes, ignorance of the requirements of their bodies, etc. We ought by all means to remedy these conditions just as far as possible. Of course the object of these efforts for physical health must be to secure mental health and intellectual development. It is not only necessary to do this in order to *secure* Socialism, but also in order to make Socialism a success *after* it is secured. Socialism cannot succeed

unless the people develop to the higher, the intellectual, plane of existence. At present, leisure and indolence are one and the same thing to large numbers of the people. Being below the intellectual plane, they have no impulse to spend leisure in any way except in dissipation. If we left them on the lower plane, the leisure brought to them by Socialism would speedily work their entire degeneracy. We cannot begin too soon to develop their higher natures. A wholesome physical development will go far toward doing this. On the other hand, those who have developed to the intellectual plane, and for whom there is therefore very little temptation to dissipate, are also in danger of physical deterioration on account of sheer disuse of their bodies, unless they also receive instruction along this line.

In view of the foregoing, I recommend the following alterations in the national constitution. And I take it for granted that in assembling the constitution for publication, the National Secretary has authority to re-number articles and sections to conform with any changes that may be made. Some of the amendments I suggest are mere verbal changes, for the sake of accuracy, or correct English.

NATIONAL CONSTITUTION OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY.

ARTICLE I.

Name.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) The name of this organization shall be the Socialist Party except in states where a different name has or may become a legal requirement.

ARTICLE II.

Membership.

Sec. 1. (Unchanged.) Every person resident of the United States of the age of eighteen years and upward without discrimination as to sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist Party, including political action, shall be eligible to membership in the Party.

Sec. 2. (Unchanged.) Any person occupying a position, honorary or remunerative, by gift of any party other than the Socialist Party (civil service positions excepted), shall not be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party.

Sec. 3. (Amended.) A member who desires to transfer his membership from the Party in one state to the Party in another state may do so upon presentation of his membership card showing him to be in good standing at the time of asking for such transfer. The secretary of the local to which he transfers shall notify the secretary of the local from which he transfers.

Sec. 4. (Unchanged.) No member of the Party, in any state or territory, shall under any pretext, interfere with the regular or organized movement in any other state.

Sec. 5 (Amended.) All persons joining the Socialist Party shall sign the following pledge: "I, the undersigned, recognizing the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class and the necessity of the working class constituting themselves into a political party distinct from and opposed to all parties formed by the capitalist class, hereby declare that I have severed my relations with all other parties, that I endorse the platform and constitution of the Socialist Party, including the principle of political action, and hereby apply for admission to said party."

Sec. 6. (Amended.) Any member of the Party who opposes or is indifferent toward political action as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership in the Party.

ARTICLE III.

Management.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) The affairs of the Socialist Party shall be administered by the National Secretary, the National Executive Committee, the National Committee, the national conventions, and the general vote of the Party.

Sec. 2. (Unchanged.) Three years' consecutive membership in the Party shall be necessary to qualify for all national official positions.

ARTICLE IV.

National Committee.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) Each organized state or territory shall be represented on the National Committee by one member and by an additional member for every three thousand members or major fraction thereof in good standing in the Party in such state. For the purpose of determining the representation to which each state or territory may be entitled, the National Secretary shall compute at the beginning of each odd numbered year the average dues paying membership of such state or territory for the preceding year. The state secretaries shall call for nominations for national committeemen immediately after the results of such computation are announced, and not before.

Sec. 2. (Amended.) The members of this committee shall be elected by referendum vote of and from the membership of the states and territories which they respectively represent. Their term of office shall be two years. They shall be subject to removal by referendum vote of their respective states.

Sec. 3. (Unchanged.) The National Committee shall meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so.

Sec. 4. (Amended.) Expenses of the National Committeemen in attending meetings, and a per diem equal to the per diem fixed for national organizers and lecturers, shall be paid from the national treasury.

Sec. 5. (Amended.) No motion shall be submitted to a referendum of the National Committee by correspondence unless supported within thirty days from the time it is mailed to the committee by not less than five members of the committee from three different states.

Sec. 6. (Unchanged.) The National Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure not inconsistent with the provisions of this constitution.

Sec. 7. (Transferred from Article V, Sec. 1, and amended.) The duties of the National Committee shall be to supervise and direct the work of the National Secretary and the National Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V.

Sec. 1. (Transferred to Article IV.)

Sec. 2. I recommend that this section be struck out.

ARTICLE VI.

National Executive Committee.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) The National Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members. They shall be elected by referendum vote. The call for nominations shall be issued on the first day of October in each odd numbered year. Each local shall be entitled to nominate seven candidates. Thirty days shall be allowed for nominations, ten for acceptances and declinations, and fifty for the referendum. Nominations by five locals shall entitle a candidate to be placed on the ballot. The names of the candidates shall be prepared for printing in alphabetical order. The ballots shall be printed in as many equal portions as there are candidates. On each successive portion after the first, the top name shall be transferred to the bottom. Each member shall be entitled to vote for seven candidates. The seven candidates receiving the highest vote shall be elected. Vacancies shall be filled by the next highest. Members of this committee may be recalled by referendum vote, in the manner herein provided for referendums.

Sec. 2. (Amended.) The duties of the National Executive Committee shall be to supervise and direct the work of the National Secretary; to organize unorganized states and territories; to receive and pass upon reports of the National Secretary; to transact all current business of the National Office, except such as is by this constitution expressly reserved for the National Committee or the general vote of the Party. The National Executive Committee shall also formulate the rules and order of business of the national conventions of the Party, not otherwise provided for by this constitution, subject to adoption, rejection or amendment by the conventions.

Sec. 3. (Amended.) The National Executive Committee shall transmit copies of the minutes of its meetings to all members of the National Committee. Such minutes shall also be published in the Monthly Bulletin. Any act of the National Executive

Committee not called in question by any member of the National Committee within ten days after notice of such act has been mailed by the National Office to the members of the National Committee shall be in force.

Sec. 5. (Amended.) The National Executive Committee shall meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so. Expenses of National Executive Committeemen in attending meetings, and a per diem equal to the per diem fixed for national organizers and lecturers, shall be paid from the national treasury.

ARTICLE VII.

National Secretary.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) The National Secretary shall be elected biennially at the same time and in the same manner as the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in a similar manner. He shall receive as compensation the sum of twenty-five dollars per week.

Sec. 2. (Amended.) The National Secretary shall have charge of all affairs of the National Office, subject to the directions of the National Executive Committee and the National Committee.

Sec. 3. (Amended.) The National Secretary shall issue to all party organizations a Monthly Bulletin, containing an itemized statement of the receipts and expenditures of the National Office, the principal business transacted by the Office, and such other matters pertaining to the organization and activity of the Party as may be of general interest to the membership. Such Bulletins shall not contain editorial comment.

Sec. 4. (Amended.) The National Secretary shall be empowered to secure such help as may be necessary for the proper transaction of the business of the National Office. Such employees may be discharged by the National Secretary, the National Executive Committee, or the National Committee.

Sec. 5. (Formerly last paragraph of Sec. 4, amended.) The National Secretary and the members of the National Executive Committee may be recalled by the Party membership.

ARTICLE VIII.

Organizers and Lecturers.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) The National Office shall be empowered to arrange organizing and lecture tours for organization and propaganda.

Sec. 2. (Amended.) The National Office shall have the right to make arrangements for the organizers and lecturers under its auspices with all state organizations of the Party.

Sec. 3. (Amended.) The National Executive Committee shall establish a uniform rate of compensation for all organizers and lecturers working under its auspices.

Sec. 4. (Additional Section.) Bulletins, statements and reports shall distinguish between organizing tours and lecture tours.

Sec. 5. (Additional Section.) Reports of results obtained by organizers shall state the number of members secured and the number of locals organized.

Sec. 6. (Additional Section.) The organizers and lecturers shall be required to handle the subscription cards of each Socialist publication that runs an organization department as a regular feature, and of such publications only.

ARTICLE IX.

Literature Department.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) The National Office shall maintain a department for the publication and dissemination of Socialist literature.

Sec. 2. (Amended.) The Literature Department shall keep for sale to the local organizations of the Party and others, a stock of Socialist books, pamphlets and other literature.

Sec. 3. (Substitute.) The Literature Department shall have the right to publish works on Socialism or for the purpose of Socialist propaganda.

ARTICLE X.

Conventions.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) The regular national convention of the Party shall be held

each year at the place where the National Headquarters are located, beginning the first day of May and continuing as long as the convention deems best.

Sec. 2. (Amended.) The program and order of business for the convention shall be prepared by the National Executive Committee, subject to adoption, rejection or amendment by the convention.

Sec. 3. (Substitute.) The basis of representation for each state and territory shall be one delegate at large and one delegate for every five hundred members.

Sec. 4. I recommend that this section be struck out.

Sec. 5. (Amended.) No delegate shall be considered eligible unless he is a member of the Party in the state from which the credential is presented, and shall have been a member of the Party consecutively for three years.

Sec. 6. (Amended.) Railroad fare of the delegates to and from the conventions, shall be paid from the national treasury.

Sec. 7. (Amended.) The election of delegates to the national convention shall close at least thirty days preceding the convention, and the respective state secretaries shall furnish the National Secretary, not later than thirty days preceding such convention, with a list of the accredited delegates to the convention.

Sec. 8. (Additional Section.) The delegates shall be elected by referendum vote in their respective states.

Sec. 9. (Formerly part of Sec. 7, amended.) The National Secretary shall prepare a printed roster of the accredited delegates, to be sent to each delegate and forwarded to the Party press for publication.

Sec. 10. (Formerly part of Sec. 7, amended.) At the time and place set for the national convention, the National Secretary shall call the convention to order, and shall call the roll to ascertain the number of uncontested delegates, and they shall permanently organize the convention.

Sec. 11. (Additional Section.) All national platforms, amendments of platforms, and resolutions, adopted by any national convention, shall be submitted seriatim by paragraphs to a referendum of the membership. One-fourth of the delegates shall be entitled to have alternative paragraphs submitted at the same time. Such alternative paragraphs shall be filed with the National Secretary not later than one day after the adjournment of the convention.

Sec. 12. (Additional Section.) Complete minutes shall be taken, but no debates. The proceedings, exclusive of speeches and mere parliamentary matter, shall be published.

ARTICLE XI.

Referendum.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as recalls and other propositions to be voted upon by the membership, shall be submitted to a referendum on the first day of January succeeding their initiation, upon request of fifty locals in five or more states or territories. Upon request of one hundred locals in five or more states and territories, they shall be submitted at once.

Sec. 2. (Substitute.) All requests for referendum shall be published in the Monthly Bulletin.

Sec. 3. (Amended.) All propositions submitted to referendum shall be submitted without preamble or comment.

ARTICLE XII.

State Organizations.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) The formation of all state or territorial organizations, and the reorganization of all state or territorial organizations which may have lapsed, shall be under the direction of the National Executive Committee, and in conformity with the rules of the National Committee.

Sec. 2. (Amended.) No state or territory may be organized unless it has at least ten locals, or an aggregate membership of not less than two hundred, but this provision shall not affect the rights of states and territories already organized. When the membership in any state averages less than one hundred and fifty per month for any six consecutive months, the National Executive Committee may revoke the charter of that state.

Sec. 3. (Amended.) The platform of the Socialist Party shall be the supreme declaration of the Party, and all state and municipal platforms shall conform there-

to; and no state or local organization shall under any circumstances fuse, combine or compromise with any other political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations, in order to favor the candidates of such other organizations, nor shall any candidate of the Socialist Party accept any nomination or endorsement from any other party or political organization.

Sec. 4. (Amended.) In states and territories in which there is one central organization affiliated with the Party, the state or territorial organizations shall have the sole jurisdiction of the members residing within their respective territories, and the sole control of all matters pertaining to the propaganda, organization and financial affairs within such state or territory; their activity shall be confined to their respective organizations, and the national officers and committees shall have no right to interfere in such matters without the consent of the respective state or territorial organizations.

Sec. 5. (Amended.) The state organizations shall make monthly reports to the National Secretary concerning their membership, financial condition and the general standing of the Party.

Sec. 6. (Substitute.) The National Office shall provide membership cards to be used by all state and local organizations for their members. No dues stamps shall be used. The locals shall have power to decide the standing of their members. The state and national executive committees shall have power to decide the standing of members-at-large of the state and national organizations respectively. Each member shall have the fact of his good standing endorsed upon his membership card by the proper secretary at the beginning of each quarter. No person whose card does not bear such endorsement shall be entitled to the rights of membership. At the beginning of each year, subscription lists shall be circulated among the members, of locals and at large, giving each an opportunity to subscribe whatever amount per month he wishes. No member shall be considered in bad standing because he does not sign such list. These lists shall be kept open constantly. Any member shall have the right to increase, decrease or withdraw his subscription at any time. Each local shall pay to the state organization every month a sum equal to twenty-five cents for each member in good standing. This sum shall be paid on or before the fifteenth day of each month for the current month. Any local in arrears shall be lapsed, and may be reinstated by paying up its arrearages. While lapsed, it shall have no voice or vote in Party affairs. Each state organization shall pay to the national organization every month a sum equal to five cents for each member in good standing. This sum shall be paid on or before the last day of each month for the current month. Any state in arrears shall be lapsed until arrearages are paid. While lapsed, it shall have no voice or vote in national Party affairs. State constitutions shall contain provisions for remitting local dues when local circumstances make it desirable.

In case the foregoing paragraph is defeated, I recommend that Sec. 6 be amended as follows: The National Office shall provide membership cards to be used by all state and local organizations for their members. Each state organization shall pay to the National Organization every month a sum equal to five cents for each member in good standing. Such dues shall be received for by adhesive dues stamps, in denominations of five cents, such dues stamps to be pasted in the membership cards of the members when they pay their dues. Members who are sick, in distress, out of work, or not engaged in a gainful occupation, may at their option have their membership cards kept in good standing without payment. Locals and members-at-large may make requisition upon the state secretaries, without payment, for dues stamps for such purpose, giving names and dates. The state organizations and locals and members-at-large in unorganized states and territories may make requisition upon the National Secretary, without payment, for dues stamps for such purpose, giving names and dates. Such dues stamps shall be uniform with all the others.

Sec. 7. (Amended.) All state organizations shall provide in their constitutions for the initiative, referendum and recall.

Sec. 8. (Amended.) No person shall be nominated or endorsed by any subdivision of the Party for candidate for any office unless he is a member of the Party and has been such for at least one year; but this provision shall not apply to organizations which have been in existence for less than one year or which have not sufficient good material of one year's standing for candidates.

Sec. 9. I recommend that this section be struck out.

Sec. 10. (Amended.) The National Executive Committee may appoint secretaries to reside in the unorganized states. A salary not to exceed eighteen dollars per week

shall be allowed them. They shall hold office subject to the National Executive Committee, provided, that when there are not less than ten locals or two hundred members in good standing in any state, a state organization may be formed, which shall then elect its own officers.

Sec. 11. (Substitute.) It shall be the policy of the National Office to assign national organizers to the weak states until their membership is increased to the point where each such state can utilize the full time of a state secretary and a state organizer.

Sec. 12. (Additional Section.) The National Office shall furnish a simple system of account keeping for the use of state and local organizations.

Sec. 13. (Additional Section.) Each candidate for public office shall be required to sign a blank resignation of such office at the time when he is nominated. Such resignation shall be filled out and filed only when ordered by referendum vote of the membership in the territory covered by the office.

ARTICLE XIII.

Headquarters.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) The National Headquarters of the Party shall be at Chicago, Illinois.

ARTICLE XIV.

International Delegates.

Sec. 1. (Amended.) Delegates to the International Socialist Congress shall be elected by referendum in the year in which the Congress is held. The call for nominations shall be made on the first day of January. The election shall be conducted in the same manner as the election of members of the National Executive Committee. There shall be one delegate for every five thousand members, ascertained by computing the average membership for the preceding year. The next highest in the election shall be the alternates. The expenses of the delegates, and a per diem equal to the per diem fixed for national organizers and lecturers, shall be paid out of the national treasury.

ARTICLE XV.

Amendments.

Sec. 1. (Unchanged.) This constitution may be amended by a national convention or by a referendum of the Party in the manner above provided. But all amendments made by a national convention shall be submitted seriatim to a referendum vote of the Party membership.

Sec. 2. (Additional Section.) All amendments shall take effect immediately upon being approved by the membership.

ARTICLE XVI.

I recommend that this Article be struck out.

I recommend the insertion of the following additional articles:

Woman's National Committee.

Sec. 1. At the beginning of each odd numbered year a Woman's National Committee of five members shall be elected from the women members of the Party by referendum vote of the entire membership, in a manner similar to the election of members of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner.

Sec. 2. Such committee shall have general charge of propaganda and organization among women. All plans of such committee, concurred in by the National Executive Committee, shall be carried out at the expense of the National Office.

Sec. 3. There shall be a Woman's Department in the National Office. The manager of this department shall be one of the regular employees of the National Office. She shall be selected by the National Secretary, with the approval of the Woman's National Committee, and may be discharged by either. The object of this department

shall be to carry out the provisions for propaganda and organization among women herein contained.

Health.

Sec. 1. At all convenient seasons the National Office shall keep one or more qualified persons in the field whose duty shall be to give both theoretical and practical lectures on the problems of health, sanitation, hygiene, diet, and all subjects pertaining to the preservation and development of physical and mental efficiency; also to act as physical director of locals and members, collectively and individually.

National Candidates.

Sec. 1. On the first day of January in each presidential year, a call for nominations for candidate for president of the United States shall be issued. Each local shall be entitled to nominate one candidate. Thirty days shall be allowed for nominations, ten for acceptances and declinations, and fifty for the referendum. Nominations by five locals shall entitle a candidate to be placed on the ballot. The names of the candidates shall be prepared for printing in alphabetical order. The ballots shall be printed in as many equal portions as there are candidates. On each successive portion after the first, the top name shall be transferred to the bottom. Each member shall be entitled to vote for one candidate. The candidate receiving the highest vote shall be the candidate for president. The next highest shall be the candidate for vice-president. In case of vacancy for president, the candidate for vice-president shall fill the vacancy. In case of vacancy for vice-president, the next highest shall fill the vacancy.

International Secretaries.

Sec. 1. Commencing the first of January in years in which an International Socialist Congress is held, the international secretaries to which the Party may be entitled shall be elected by referendum vote, in the same manner as the members of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall also be filled in the same manner.

Local Officers.

Sec. 1. The officers of locals and branches shall consist of secretary, treasurer, literature agent, and such others as may be deemed necessary.

Fraternally submitted,

JOHN M. WORK,
Reporter on Organization.

It did not occur to me that it was an insult. I would like to know why.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): I will tell you why I think it is an insult. I have been a member of a trade union, and there were booze fighters in the union, and they were members of the working class, in contact with the workers, and though they have not attained to the degree of intellectuality of assuming that they were the working class of the United States, or at least its political expression, they would not use in a report to their trade unions the personal pronoun I seventeen times in fifteen minutes. They knew that what they had to do was to fight the boss who was a member of a church, and who on Sunday donated \$500 to the propagation of the gospel and came in on Monday morning with a ten per cent reduction to the labor organization of which I was a member. I have never touched liquor since I was ten

Motion seconded.

The motion to refer the report to the Committee on Constitution was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion now is that the report as submitted by Del. Work be not printed. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I would like to have some reasons presented.

years of age, so I quit booze fighting early, but I know that in all the struggles of the working class the men that are termed booze fighters are on the job. While I do not drink liquor myself, I have enough sense to know that there may be other people who think that it may be just as much use to them as the breakfast foods that may be recommended by the comrade who uses the personal pronoun so often. I want to make no personal allusions, but there are booze fighters in this Congress who have been selected to preside over its destinies for some of its sessions, and I find that they are more reliable than the gospel sharks who are not booze fighters. (Laughter and applause.) I am not and never will be a purist who believes that all the virtues of humanity have been centered in my brain, nor will I ever, I hope, get into that situation where I will presume that if selected as a member of the Socialist Party to investigate and make a report, that what I know is what the party ought to conceive to be the only knowledge on the subject. I hope I will never arrive at that place. Now, who is it that is in the working class? As I rode into this city yesterday through Gary, Indiana, I saw working men, and no doubt they were booze fighters, but a man who works at the job that they work at and is not a booze fighter will be a mental degenerate. (Applause.) If you would go to Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, you would find a booze fighter who is one of the best comrades that they had in the State of Pennsylvania, who spoke to the members of the working class there, and put enough spirit into them. So that there were no state constabulary in the neighborhood where there were booze fighters. Now, if you had been in the city of Philadelphia and had seen that state constabulary, who have a high moral character (Laughter)—at least so we are assured by the Chaplain of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, and by the Chaplain of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania, and by the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, and by a gentleman who sells booze for the respectable and wealthy classes of Pennsylvania, that that state constabulary is respectable—you would find that the very people who drove the state constabulary out of the city of Philadelphia were booze fighters. When they opened up a line of

the Rapid Transit Company in the neighborhood where I live—and I am probably the only one who doesn't fight booze in the neighborhood—I can't call them ladies, they would not be proud of the title, for they make no claims to intellectual ability—but when they opened up that line they came out and said, "All right,"—I won't use the language they did, but I think none the less of them for the language they used, though it would not come under the title of high moral character—they said: "When we get through washing our breakfast dishes, you sons of sea cooks, we will go out and tend to you." And they did; they attended to the sons of sea cooks. There was one brutal police officer—let me explain why I mention this case. There was a friend of mine said, "Moore, I am sorry you were not here a few minutes ago." I said "Why?" He said, "Why, you would have seen a woman drive a policeman down the street and cuss him like a trooper." I do not like to hear a woman cuss I cuss myself when there is no woman present, if there is provocation, and there was provocation then. That policeman told this woman that if she did not stop yelling "scab" he would kick down that fence and pull her in. She made a remark that I won't repeat here, but the gist of her remark was that, "If you come in behind that fence there will be a job for the undertaker." She was not a woman of high moral character. Now, I do not want to take up too much time, but I am giving you some very few reasons why I consider the report is an insult to the members of the working class who drink.

DEL. M'DERMOTT (Mont.): I was thoroughly in sympathy with Comrade Work's recommendation, but since hearing the comrade I believe we ought to get the booze fighters to take other places. Now, I am not a booze fighter myself, but probably I do know something about it, and I do know this, that it is not booze that makes intellectual men, but an intellectual man can fall lower on account of booze and may do things that he would not do ordinarily on account of booze, that he would not do if he were in his proper sense. Now, here is my position in this. Comrade Work's recommendations were recommendations to work along a higher line. I believe it is necessary for the working class to raise them

selves physically and mentally if they are going to accomplish anything, and if Socialism is not an advance on the present intellectual, moral and physical system I do not know what it is. It is utterly impossible for the working class of today to step into Socialism and make it a success. I do not believe in utter impossibilities. I do not believe in making a hard and fast rule, because I know that the working class have got many things to work out in their own way, but I do believe that our tendency should be upward rather than downward. If we are to fight this fight on an animal plane and get full of booze and go out and hit somebody on the head and think that is an argument that is going to carry the day, we are badly mistaken. Now I believe that amongst the working class themselves there is a feeling that they desire something better. They do not desire the same things in the Socialist system that they desire in the capitalist system. There is no question that the whole capitalist system is forcing them into the degradation they are in and is making the drink evil possible. Now if they are going to step out of this system into a better system they simply want to get prepared for it. You are not going into the higher mathematics all in a jump, nor are you going into Socialism with a better mental, moral and physical system than you have now unless you learn something about it.

DEL. HOOGERHYDE (Mich.): After listening to the comrade across the hall and the comrade in the rear, I have come to the conclusion that we are all of us, each and every one of us, booze fighters. We fight it in different ways, perhaps. I think the comrade across the hall made the best temperance speech that I have heard for a long time. I do not altogether agree with him on the question as to whether this report, or what has been read of it, should appear in the printed proceedings. I think it ought all of it to be printed, but not in the proceedings, but I think a portion of it should be submitted.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): I want to support the motion of Comrade O'Neill. There are several reasons why this report should not be printed. I came to the convention two years ago, and because I could not endorse certain propositions here I was regarded as an impossibilist. Are we going to run the

risk at the present time of being again called impossibilists? Comrade Work in his report starts out and tells us that the first qualification of a Socialist must be high character. Now, I have no objection to the Socialist Party being composed of men and women of the highest character; but, unfortunately, the capitalist conditions under which we live, and under which we suffer, and under which we must work, do not permit the working class to develop the highest character, and we have got to take the working class Socialists as they are, low character or high character. (Applause.) What we must do is to get out among the working class, and organize them and make them a class conscious working class, and then let us get Socialism. When we get Socialism we can remove those evils of society that now cause that low character to which Comrade Work seems so much opposed. As long as present conditions exist, it is immaterial whether you stop the sale of liquor legally or not. The liquor is going to be sold, and everything else in which there is a profit is going to be sold, either legally or illegally. So our fight is not so much against the legal or illegal sale of liquor, as it is against the profit system and to give the working class a chance to develop themselves spiritually, mentally, morally and physically, which they never will be able to do until you abolish the capitalist system. Now, Comrade Work tells us about the pamphlet he got up on organization and agitation. He tells us that he made suggestions, and we infer from his report that all that now remains to be done is for us to carry out the suggestions. But we are not going to be prevented at the same time from making some suggestions. We all of us will probably have some suggestions to make, and we will ask Comrade Work to carry out our suggestions. Another recommendation he makes is, that the terms of all of the members of the national committee shall begin and expire at one time. I have no fault to find with the spirit that prompts Comrade Work to make the recommendation, but I wish to point out the fact that in some of our states we have primary laws, and election laws, which provide how the various political parties shall elect their national committee men.

However, much I may differ as to a great many of Comrade Work's sug-

gestions, he made one on which I wish to congratulate him, and that is in reference to the preferential referendum. He says he does not wish to introduce an amendment because the membership recently voted it down. Now, two years ago in the national convention, after a warm and heated battle, the so-called radicals of that convention succeeded in fixing up the question of the land and the immediate demands in the platform as they saw fit, and as they saw right. After the adjournment of that convention, notwithstanding the fact that the party membership had ratified the work done in the convention, Comrade Work introduced an amendment to change the land proposition in our platform. If he had then been as modest as he has shown himself today, I think the delegates in the Western section of this country, who are attempting to build up an organization, would not be required to spend so much time apologizing for a platform dealing with the land question, as they find it necessary to do since the last referendum passed by this party. Now he wishes to make a distinction between organizers and lecturers. There may be some reason for distinction there. Some of us who are sent out on the road as organizers can get up on the soap box and talk some. You can also get out amongst the booze fighters and organize locals. Others are not ashamed to get in and work for Socialism among booze fighters, but when we get upon the platform in a crowded hall, surrounded perhaps by the dilettante of the community, we are somewhat at a loss and cannot be termed lecturers. Now, I haven't any objections to be termed an organizer and let others be termed lecturers any time they wish, but when they are sent out to work for Socialism, whether as organizers or lecturers, we must reach all classes in order to succeed. Comrade Work also tells us about editing the stenographic report. We, who were at the last convention, when we got that report, knew it was edited, pretty well cut down in a great many particulars. On the whole, instead of Comrade Work's report dealing with the subject of organization which was assigned to him, he seems to have taken up the greater portion of his time in dealing in tactics and policies. As far as organization is concerned, we are as much at sea now as we were before he read his report. Again, he makes

a proposition that for each member there should be 25 cents paid, and does not specify for what time, whether a day, a month, or a year, and he is going to leave it entirely to voluntary contributions. Now, here is the question I want to impress upon you, that he is tending in the wrong direction. The dues of the Socialist Party at the present time are too low. They do not give you sufficient funds to do efficient work. As a general rule, the local dues are 25 cents; the state gets five cents and the national office five cents, which leaves 15 cents for the local, no matter how much work your Secretary has got to do. You very seldom have enough over to pay for stationery and postage. Your state office is crippled, and the national office is crippled. In other words, the Socialist Party, as at the present time composed, is entirely too cheap. You should raise the dues. The national office should have 15 or 20 cents and the state office should have 15 or 20 cents, and the local office at least 15 or 20 cents. Then you would have money with which to work.

One more suggestion, and I am through; and that is in regard to local secretaries. Our organization throughout the United States depends entirely upon the locals. If we have got an efficient local secretary we have a good local. Each local is paying a per capita to the state and national office, and if the local secretary can be induced to get out and work and call upon the members of the local when their dues are expired and collect those dues, we will have a good strong local. When we look over the reports of different secretaries we find we are taking plenty of new men into the Socialist Party all the time, but we are not holding them. They attend one or two meetings and they are gone, and we find them no more. But with a good local secretary, an active local secretary to keep after those men when the time is up to pay their dues, and collect them, we build up a good membership and we build up an efficient and able organization.

DEL. SIMONS (III.): I want to make a point of order before this discussion proceeds any further. As it stands now, the question of the character of the report is not before us for discussion, and it is not proper to go into a discussion of all of the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Comrade Chairman: It seems to me wise at this stage of the proceedings, to call the attention of the comrades to a fact that perhaps we are overlooking. This is a congress; this is a conference. I think I disagree with almost everything that Comrade Work said, but I take off my hat to Comrade Work, because he has done precisely the thing that I was hoping he would do. I do not care the snap of my finger for what John Work thinks. It is his right to think for himself. But I do want his thought and the other fellow's thought. John Work and the other comrades were picked out to do something that would somehow or other help us, the officers of the party, and those outside of the officers, in the districts all over this country, to get ideas at this Congress as to the best method of doing organization work in the future. I think you will admit that John Work, whether you agree with him or not, has started your thinking pans into action, and that is at least a very important step toward what we want. If he has done that, let us be honest enough to give him credit for it. If he wants to fight booze, all right; but don't you and I get off the main track.

Now, another thing, don't let us shut off discussion on those motions of Comrade Simons and others. I want you to recognize that what you are sent here for is not to carry this or that motion, nor to shut off debate at the end of two minutes. I think the purpose of this Congress is that we should come here and take up these various suggestions and reports. We have heard criticism over some of the acts of the National Executive Committee. I am one of them. I tell you frankly, I would like to know the will of the Socialist Party. I am a human being, and the only way that I can get your will is for you to tell the things that you stand for, and I know that the closer I get to you the better I am going to do my work. The same way with the National Secretary. Don't let us do anything to shut off discussion. Take up Work's report and discuss it, if you want to, clear up to adjournment time. If you want to have a vote then, all right, but not before that. Let us discuss it and take all the various matters in the report. The same way

with the Woman's Committee. Let us discuss that thoroughly and don't try to take any action, until we are through with the discussion. It may sound ridiculous in some reports, but after all it comes back to you and me, and there may be a mass of things that it is impossible to vote to adopt, but there will be individuals in the different localities that will help put them into practice. Let us recognize that. Let us make, as the result of what John Work has proposed, a very few simple changes in the constitution and, having done that, let us take the ideas that he suggests and others suggest in this discussion, and then let us go home and see how those ideas will pass with our communities. Here is a chance to find out whether they are workable or unworkable, and then when we come back in a year from now, or two years from now, we will know better how to deal with the questions. It is not a question of the superiority of men that drink liquor or do not; it is not a question of the superiority of men that smoke or do not smoke; but when I meet comrades who cannot control themselves I take good care never to invite them into a saloon, because I want them to be in good shape to work for the cause of Socialism. As far as I am concerned, I hope I will never get drunk, but if I ever do, it will be the day after we get Socialism, and not the day before. (Applause.) Not because I am a temperance man, but because it is a business proposition. Now, let us take up these suggestions.

Take, for instance, the matter of organizers. I want to say something that I would like to have you clearly understand. In justice to myself, I want to call the attention of the comrades to a fact that perhaps you do not know, that as long as I am a national organizer and on the Executive Committee I shall not ask the National Secretary to give me any more dates as national organizer, because I wish to be absolutely free. I am interested in the matter of organizers. I have seen many criticisms concerning national organizers, and as far as I am personally concerned I have benefited by some of the criticism. On the other hand, many of the criticisms have been very unjust. Why have they been unjust? I will tell you why; simply because the comrades do not realize the circumstances. Take the pay of the organizers. When the proposition was

made to raise the pay of national organizers to \$4 instead of \$3—

DEL. SCHNAIDT (Ohio): I rise to a point of order. I do not like to make points of order all the time, but the last comrade is taking up the most of his time discussing something that is going to come up under a later order of business, and it will be gone over again.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate is not in order. He rose for the purpose of making a point of order and not to talk. The Chair rules the point of order is well taken. That discussion is covering specific matters and suggestions that will come before this body later. We are anticipating those subjects, and we will go over the same ground again. The simple proposition before the house is the desirability or undesirability of printing the report. That is the question, and if the delegates will confine themselves to it, the other matters involved in this report will come before this congress later and can be then discussed to the limit. I suggest that we discuss the desirability or undesirability of printing the report.

DEL. GOEBEL: I think that the members of the party will want to know what is coming up and what is not coming up. If you want to shut off debate, as far as I am concerned, I can take care of myself because I am a quick speaker and a quick actor. Some of the others may not be. If you want to shut off debate and pass the motion and go home, let us get through with it tomorrow and go home. But if it is the purpose to get the views of the various delegates from the various states and the comrades who sent them here, let us have the debate and then we will know their views. Now, this is the point I want to make. I will just give you my point in a few words. I am the oldest appointed organizer. I am not ashamed of it. I am proud of it. I am a paid organizer. Comrade Morgan, if you are here, I want you to know that I am a paid organizer. I would rather work for Socialism at twelve dollars a week on an average than make fifty dollars a week serving capitalism. Now let us take up about three minutes on the matter of organizers. I am not going to be personal and should not have been personal, and I apologize. Now let us look at politics for a moment. Let us take up Comrade Work's

suggestion. Let us make a distinction and call one a lecturer and the other an organizer. When a member is on an organizing tour, have that man paid as an organizer, and when he is out on a straight lecture tour under the auspices of the State Committee, then call him a lecturer. In other words, if we put an organizer into the State of Ohio, and at the end of the month he cannot show any locals, and the comrades read the report, they will say, "We put Goebel in Ohio one whole month, and he did not organize one local." I want a square deal. John Work said it was not a square deal, and we ought to make a distinction between a locality where they can organize and where they cannot organize.

Another thing, I think the time is coming when we will change the work of national organizers, and take a couple comrades to go out and speak and organize together in a city or state, and in that way I believe we are going to develop a class of organizers that will accomplish more than we have in the past.

COM. HUNTER (Conn.): I am very sorry indeed that this report has been put forward in the form it has, and I feel like making an apology to a certain extent as a member of the National Executive Committee for having a lot of pious talk put forward here to the Congress, a good deal of it not at all related with the question of organization, as far as I can see. (Applause.) I am very glad to have Comrade Work's view; I am very glad to have the views of any man, whether I agree with him or differ with him. But there are times when I want to hear those views, and there are other times when I do not want to hear those views, and I do not want to hear his views on some subjects not related to organization. We are supposed to come here to discover how we can improve our organization in this country. Now, the Executive Committee endeavored at this time and in this Congress to carry out the will of the last Congress, and it was to have the views of the members boiled down in short and concise language, giving the vast experience and study of a long time, for the purpose of putting it before this Congress for the purpose of discussion, and you cannot hope to have any individual come here and express his views and have those views accord with the views of everybody else.

DEL. GOEBEL: My amendment is to the effect that the delegates to this Congress shall, however, receive copies of this report as now in print.

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes, that is it. Del. Goebel's amendment was seconded.

COM. SPARGO: I am decidedly in favor of the motion to refer the report to a committee. I understand that the report as prepared by Comrade Work is in print. I believe that was the decision of the National Executive Committee, that it should be printed, and, as a matter of personal information and for the benefit of those comrades who desire to keep it in some archives of theirs, as curiosities of Socialist literature, I think it is well that we should have it. (Laughter.) But it does seem to me that to protect our own reputation for sanity we ought to refer that report to a committee. The desire of the Executive Committee, in asking Comrade Work to prepare a work on the subject of organization, was not to learn how we could improve the morals or the physique of individual members of this party. We referred to Comrade Work for consideration a problem pressing upon us at all times: how can we most effectively help the working class of this country to organize politically and economically to protect its own interests? We had no reason under the sun to suppose that we should have dragged before this congress the question whether the working class benefited by smoking cigars or cigarettes or drinking cocktails or beer. If Comrade Work or any other comrade in this meeting thinks that the smoking of tobacco is of vital importance and that it is a vital injury to the working class of this country, Comrade Work and such comrades can fight that evil by joining the anti-tobacco league. (Applause.) For myself, I refuse to consent that this Socialist Party is to be made an adjunct to any anti-vivisection league, to an anti-vaccination league, to an anti-tobacco league, to an anti-drink league, no matter what my personal opinion upon any of those questions may be.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I rise to a question of information through the National Secretary, as to whether or not this report is now in printed form at this minute.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): Yes, it is in print.

DEL. GOEBEL: Then I want to amend the amendment, if I may.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no amendment. There is a subsidiary motion to refer to a committee.

DEL. GOEBEL: I want to amend that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: That amendment is proper. The Chair will receive it. State the amendment.

I have never heard in my life any statement of fact, any collection of human experiences,

which would warrant me in the belief that the German-American working man in Milwaukee who drinks his Pabst beer votes less intelligently than the working man in the prohibition state of Maine. (Applause.) I have never heard in my life any argument, any statement of fact, which led me to believe that the men, who either as a class, or as a group within a class, did not smoke tobacco, voted any more intelligently than the men who do smoke tobacco. I am not afraid to stand up by my brother who drinks a glass of beer more than I do, and march to the same goal with him. I may want to fight a special thing—and I am interested in fighting a great many other things than come within the purview of the Socialist program. But because I believe in some important things, some special reforms in hygiene, some special reforms in medicine, some special reforms in dress, some special reform in the marriage law, some special kind of stenography, as my friend Work believes in the artificial language, Esperanto, there is no reason under the sun why I should come with them to a congress of the Socialist Party. I say, "Take this upon your own shoulders, Comrade Work. If you want Esperanto, do your propaganda through the Esperanto League, and leave the Socialist Party to do propaganda for Socialism. (Applause.) If you want me to stop smoking, do your propaganda through the anti-tobacco organizations, and not through the Socialist Party. If you want me to stop drinking, do it through the abstinence societies, and not through the Socialist Party." We have got one business here, and that is to marshal the forces of the working class of America, to march right up to the ballot box and say, "Capitalism must go, and we will attend to these other questions in due time."

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): The National Executive Board asked, or rather required, Comrade Work to have this report printed. However, the National Secretary just informs me that Comrade Work never handed him the copy, so the report is not printed. I did not know that. It is a matter for you to decide whether it will come before you or not, but I will just state as a point of information that the report is not printed as yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: The original motion was that the report be not printed. A motion was made that the

matter be referred to a special committee of five with instructions to purge such parts as they deem proper to expunge, and that the remainder be printed. An amendment the instructions was made that original report be printed. Now question comes upon the motion refer with the instructions stated.

DEL. GOEBEL: I rise to a point of order. You have not stated my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Didn't I get correct?

DEL. GOEBEL: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you please state it?

DEL. GOEBEL: My amendment simply provides that the delegates this Congress shall have an exact copy of his report, not that it shall go outside.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): I just want to say a few words, and I will close. I believe we have some misunderstanding with one another. I do not think the last comrade on the floor thoroughly meant everything he said, and I also believe that Comrade Work thoroughly meant everything he said, but they both meant the same thing, but misunderstood each other. Comrade Work may believe it to be in the best interests of the organization to go through certain channels, and if he believes that, he has a right to his view. The other comrades believe the channels should be left out, and they have a right to their views, regardless of my views on any such question, when the majority decides let us as Milwaukee does, get down to work and go ahead.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): I trust that this report will be printed entirely and that then at the bottom of the report we shall have printed: "Voted down unanimously by this Congress." Then I hope that this report shall be sent to all labor organizations and other organizations interested in the Socialist Party. I do not want to have this report printed, and then defeat it and then keep it out of the books of this organization. It is bound to leak out sooner or later, and I know positively that in the organization that belongs to, the machinists' organization, they have all kinds of booze fights from the first class to the last class, and I know that they would resent any statement if we were not able to say that we voted it down to a delegate.

If we are going to draw the members of the Socialist Party from the ethical societies, don't let us make the basis on the class struggle, but on the basis: Do you know anything about ethics? Do you practice morality in its highest form?

I suggest, comrades, if this is to be adopted—I refer specifically to the moral side of this—this report has two sides: it reflects the work of Comrade Work and he worked very hard—but one is the moral side, and the other is the organization side, the work that he was instructed to do. It only proves that the convention of 1908 had no business to give a proposition like that to one man, and this is the punishment that we get. I am only sorry Comrade Work did not make it stronger than he did. There is not a single working man or working woman in the world that has not the habits of capitalism impressed upon his mind. Why are we organized? Why are we the Socialist Party? Why do we oppose capitalism? Because of that very fact, that we realize in all our conventions, in all our meetings, in all our literature, that capitalism is at the bottom of all these things. Then we go ahead and say that this is the main question.

In Chicago and New York and other great centers, there are millions that are addicted to one habit or another; those habits cannot be taken away from human society; this is not a question of water or a question of land. You are dealing with flesh and blood. You are dealing with habits that have been created and developed for centuries and centuries. Now when this comrade comes and says, abolish the drink question before you do any organization work, he takes a position that is untenable and does not belong in this conference.

There is another side to this: the question of organization proper. The report says we ought to abolish dues—the most important proposition in this report—we ought to abolish the dues system in local affairs, and take up contributions and subscriptions. Now, comrades, if you want a sure way to abolish efficiency in the Socialist Party, abolish the dues system, and you will have a voluntary organization, carrying on volunteer work, with absolutely no responsibility at all. Just imagine in Chicago—I know something about Chicago—just imagine in Chicago a Socialist Party based on voluntary con-

tributors. Do you know how long the Socialist Party would remain the Socialist Party? Just long enough for Roger Sullivan and other tricky politicians to come in and say, "We are voluntary Socialists," and every yellow dog would turn into a Socialist and they would want control of the Socialist Party here and in New York. That idea springs from the same source and the same mind that these other ideas come from, that the preferential system is the salvation of the Socialist Party. I don't think there is a booze fighter anywhere that thinks the preferential system is of any value to the Socialist Party. I say to you that whatever system we adopt, the voters are going to have their way, and if 23 is in front of Fraenckel's name that won't make him skip out. I tell you, comrades, it is not a question of figures. It is a question of understanding the Socialist Party.

I would be ashamed if this report was adopted by this Congress and, then we would go and say: Look what a lot of moral fellows we are in the Socialist Party. That is purely the cry of the non-worker, purely the cry of those who live on Postum and other cereals, purely the cry of those who do not comprehend the proletarian, revolutionary, militant movement, which the Socialist Party ought to be.

In conclusion I hope you will vote this down. It ought to be printed in large type and then voted down, so that the working class of the United States may see that the Socialist Party is the party of the working class, and not the party of any other class.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): I believe that all the delegates are satisfied that this report should go to a committee. That is the motion before the house. You can decide afterwards as to printing it if you want to. I therefore call for the question.

The call for the previous question was seconded by several delegates.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): A point of information. If this be sent to a committee to be slaughtered or to make any changes that they see fit to make, shall we, after that action has been taken, hear the report read before the convention before it is finally decided upon, and if we shall not, is there any way of securing the revised report so that we may know whether it should be printed or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: For the information of this delegate and others, all reports of committees must come to this body and must be acted upon by this body; so that all of this matter will be thrown before this body again.

The motion for the previous question was then put and carried.

The secretary read the motion before the house as amended as follows:

"That this report be referred to a committee of five to be revised and such matter expunged as may not be pertinent to the business of the Socialist Party, and that such revised report be printed after revision."

DEL. GOEBEL offers an amendment that the report, as now printed, be distributed to the delegates.

DEL. HILLQUIT: We are informed that the reports have not been printed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now is on the original motion to refer with instructions.

On a division, the motion to refer to a committee of five was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the delegates that the rules read that chairmen and reporters of committees making reports shall have thirty minutes to close the discussion upon their respective reports. It is called to my attention that possibly Comrade Work may desire to occupy that time.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I think the rules mean that he shall have thirty minutes when his report comes out for final action.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will so understand it. Comrade Berger made the rule and Berger ought to understand it. We now come to the election of this committee.

The following were nominated for the committee:

Hillquit, Moore, Lewis (Ore.), Lewis (Ill.), Maynard, Houston, O'Hare, Gaylord, Furman, Simons, Cannon, Berger, Prevey, Wilson, Fraenckel and D'Orsay.

The following accepted the nomination:

Moore, Lewis (Ore.), Lewis (Ill.), Maynard, O'Hare, Berger, Prevey, Wilson, Fraenckel, D'Orsay.

COMMITTEE ON COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): I move that a committee of five be appointed or elected to consider the commission form of government.

DEL. ROSE: I wish to second the

motion for the reason that we are having the same experience in Mississippi, and we are threatened with this commission form of government. We have a condition there, where they do not even give us the recall. We regard it as dangerous; very dangerous, and while we have had no lead from the national organization as to what we shall do, we have a very large suspicion of this commission form of government.

DEL. WHITE (Mass.): We are going at this proposition just as we did two years ago. We appointed a commission to consider this commission form of government and in selecting that committee we did not select a single person who came from a state where they had this form of government. It struck me at that time as a mistake not to appoint some members of the committee from communities where they had this commission form of government. I think we should consider this question well, and if Comrade Wilson's motion is in order, I think we should support it.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): I think the question of naturalization should be included.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I move that the question of poll tax be also referred to that committee.

DEL. M'LEVY (Conn.): I am opposed to the amendment. This question of the commission form of government is one of the most important before this congress. The business men's associations and the manufacturers' associations are agitating putting the commission form of government into practice, and they are also opposed to the initiative and referendum being attached to it. Now, this is one of the most important matters to come before this congress, and I want to emphasize the fact that I am opposed to this committee having anything to do except to consider this commission form of government.

The amendment of Del. Merrick was then put and defeated.

The motion to appoint a committee of five to consider the commission form of government was then carried.

The following nominations for this committee were then made:

Jacobsen (Ia.), Work (Ia.), Branstetter (Okla.), Rose (Miss.), Carey (Mass.), Thompson (Wis.), Royal (S. C.), Hillquit (N. Y.), Wilson (Calif.), McLevy (Conn.), Hunter (Conn.).

Adams (Pa.), Furman (N. Y.), Collins (Colo.), Osborne (Calif.), Hutchisson (Ala.)

The following nominees accepted the nomination:

Jacobsen, Branstetter, Rose, Thompson, Royal, McLevy, Collins, Osborne, Hutchisson.

On the suggestion of National Executive Committeeman Hunter, each of the nominees, in accepting, was requested to state whether the state they came from had, or was threatened with, the commission form of government.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Resolutions will meet to-night at eight o'clock at the National Headquarters and delegates who wish to introduce resolutions should present them in writing at that time.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): The Committee on Constitution is aware of the fact that there are many who wish to make suggestions with reference to amendments to the constitution. We ask for your benefit, and for ours, and in order that your propositions may be considered most carefully, that you see that they are in proper form. There are nine members of this committee; there are two stenographers in the ante-room at your service. Please see to it that your suggestions are put in writing and handed to the committee at once.

Telegrams were received from Local Augusta, Ga., and from the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Society in convention in New York, and Young People's Soc. Federation, as follows:

New York, May 15, 1910.
J. Mahlon Barnes, Sec'y Socialist Party,
Masonic Temple, Chicago, Ill.

Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of U. S. of America, assembled in convention at Labor Temple, New York City, sends fraternal greetings to convention of Socialist Party, and they feel sure your work will prove another great step towards emancipation of the working class from capitalistic thrall-dom.

WM. MEYER, Sec'y.
Masonic Temple, Chicago, Ill.
Wm. Meyer, Sec'y,
Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of U. S., Labor Temple,
243 East 84th Street,
New York City.
Your telegram received. Socialist

Party of America, in congress assembled, sends fraternal greetings to your convention, looking forward to a continuance of present hearty co-operation in the class was.

GEORGE E. ROEWER, Jr.,
Secretary Congress.

Augusta, Ga., May 15, 1910.
Socialist National Congress,
Masonic Temple, Chicago.

Most cordial congratulations from Local Augusta, Georgia, to comrades assembled in national congress at Chicago. Give us your co-operation and send us an apostle.

LOCAL AUGUSTA.

New York, May 15, 1910.
National Convention Socialist Party,
Chicago.

Greetings. May you accomplish your object. Don't forget youth.
YOUNG PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST FEDERATION.

LOUIS STONE,
Financial Sec'y and Treas.

On motion of Del. Wilson, the secretary was instructed to draft and send a proper reply to the telegram from the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Society.

SEC. ROEWER: You will please notice that this morning we did not have a roll call of delegates. I think it is quite essential that we should have a roll call of the delegates in order that the comrades in the various states may see whether their representatives are here or not. Sec. B, Paragraph 2, of the rules reads: "A roll call of the delegates shall be made at each session immediately after the chairman calls the congress to order."

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): If we follow the procedure of the American Federation of Labor and the International Typographical Union, every delegate will hand in his card at the door when he comes in within a stated time, say within the first half hour, or the first hour, and afterwards the secretary can make out a list of those present. We can thus avoid some injustice. For instance I am reported absent yesterday morning, and at the same time I am reported as making three or four motions. Now, if I was absent, how did I make the motions?

DEL. ROEWER: I move that all the delegates hand in their cards at the

door when we resume this afternoon, and at all subsequent sessions.

The motion was carried unanimously.

READING CLERK STREBEL (N. Y.): The result of the election of a committee of five to consider Comrade Work's report on organization is reported by the tellers as follows: Berger, 74; Prevey, 59; Moore, 49; Maynard, 49, and a tie between Comrades Fraenckel and Lewis of Oregon at 47; Wilson, 46; A. M. Lewis, 45; O'Hare, 35; D'Orsay, 28.

Delegates Berger, Prevey, Moore and Maynard were declared elected and on motion a show of hands was taken to decide the tie, and resulted in the election of Delegate Fraenckel, as the fifth member of the committee.

COM. SPARGO: I rise to a question of personal privilege. I ask the congress that the order of business be so

changed that the report of the committee on immigration may be taken up as the first order to-morrow morning for the reason that there are majority and minority reports, and since I find that I shall have to leave before the subject can be reached in its proper order, I want to be here to present the minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to placing the report on immigration as a special order for to-morrow's morning session?

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I move to amend by placing it immediately after the report on general propaganda.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection it will be inserted as a special order, following the report on general propaganda. There being no objection it is so ordered. The congress is adjourned to 2 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The congress was called to order at 2:30 P. M.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first business, after the chairman makes an announcement or two, will be the report of the committee on propaganda. But before the committee reports I want to read the instructions by the chairman to the sergeant-at-arms. The sergeant-at-arms will please locate one messenger in each aisle to keep it free, and to insist that all visitors be seated in the back of the hall. Messengers are also required to assist the chair in keeping order, by preventing loud talking other than by delegates upon the floor.

Delegates who have not put in their slip announcing their presence will please do so. The sergeant-at-arms is collecting the slips that announce the presence of the delegates. All those not handing in this slip will be recorded as absent.

Is the secretary ready to read the report of the tellers on the selection of the committee on the commission form of government?

DEL. O'NEIL: The committee is ready to report, but Comrade Strebler has the report and he is not present at this moment.

DEL. KENNEDY (Pa.): Just before the last session closed these little pamphlets were handed round. After the session closed I went around and saw them lying on the tables. This is

not a propaganda pamphlet. This contains information as to the action taken by the Chief of Police, of Newcastle, Pa. If these men are convicted it will mean twelve years in the penitentiary. This was intended to call your attention to the state of affairs in Newcastle, Pennsylvania.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): Right along in that line we have several things—I am very much interested along that line; the training I had in the early days as an attorney made me interested along that line. It was then I first learned that the rules of socialist action among the people are fixed by rules of law that cannot be gotten by the people, and the time is now ripe with the conditions as they now exist and with the literature that is lying before us, that on a great occasion like this we should take some move toward upsetting the present rotten court system of the United States of America; and I want to introduce a motion along that line.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a special order arranged and adopted by the congress and under that rule the report of the Committee on Propaganda is before the house as the next business in order, and unless this body wishes to change that rule, that will be the next business. I would suggest to Delegate Collins, that if you have anything of that nature that you desire to introduce, that you draft it as a resolu-

AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 16, 1910

61

tion and submit it to the committee on resolutions.

DEL. COLLINS: I move that the rules of this congress be suspended and that this congress take up forthwith the resolution now offered, demanding a National Constitutional Convention, to wipe out the present despotic court system of the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion to suspend the rules. Those who favor it will say aye. Those opposed, no.

The motion to suspend the rules was declared lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade can present that matter to the Committee on Resolutions. The report of the Committee on Propaganda is the next in order. Delegate Hillquit will present the report.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): Comrades: I do not suppose you wish me

to strain my voice unduly. At any rate I do not intend to do so. If you care to listen to this, you will please be in order so that you can do so. It is something extraordinary for me to read a report from manuscript, or to make a speech from manuscript, but such is the order of the National Executive Committee and as a dutiful soldier I submit.

DELEGATE: I move that printed copies be passed out to the delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded that the printed reports be handed out to the delegates.

The motion was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates will be in order. We have distributed all the copies we have and we have sent for more.

The report on the propaganda of Socialism as printed was as follows:

THE PROPAGANDA OF SOCIALISM.

THE AIM OF OUR PROPAGANDA.

The propaganda of Socialism is a subject as vast as the Socialist movement itself. It embraces all our efforts to convert the unconverted, it brings us face to face with all practical and theoretical problems of the Socialist movement, and conjures up all differences of opinion within our ranks.

All the more reason is there for us to discuss the subject thoroughly and dispassionately.

I am not so sanguine as to hope that in this discussion we may evolve a program of propaganda and a plan of action which will meet with our unanimous approval on all points. I realize that some of our disagreements are based on fundamentally divergent views of the nature and aims of the Socialist movement, and can hardly be obviated. But I also believe that a great part of our controversies rest upon misunderstandings arising from a lack of opportunity to meet more frequently in a frank and friendly interchange of views.

What I hope that this convention may accomplish is to remove these trivial and non-essential disagreements and evolve a positive program of action based upon such views and conceptions as are held in common by the vast majority, if not by all, organized American Socialists. For notwithstanding our heated and frequent discussions, there are surely more things to unite us than to separate us.

In laying my views on the subject before you, I do not claim for them the authority of official party sanction. They are my individual views. I alone am responsible for them and I ask you to regard them merely as a basis for discussion.

I will start with a fundamental proposition upon which we shall probably all agree, namely, that OUR MOVEMENT CANNOT SUCCEED UNLESS WE HAVE THE MASSES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WITH US.

Whether the Socialist commonwealth will be ushered in by a popular proclamation, or by legislative or governmental enactment; whether it will be the spontaneous result of a sanguinary revolution or the culmination of a series of gradual and peaceful reforms; whether political action, industrial struggle or ethical education will be the principal factor in the impending social transformation, or whether all these factors will co-operate to bring about the desired change, it must come as the expression of the will of a very large portion, if not the absolute majority, of the people. Regardless, therefore, of our special beliefs and differences, our supreme and common task is, to make more Socialists. The concrete problem before us is to evolve methods by which the message of Socialism can be carried to the largest number of people with the greatest effectiveness and the least waste of energy.

We must adopt a carefully laid, well defined and consistent plan of propaganda, and attempt to train our members to steady, uniform and harmonious actions along the lines of such a plan. Such a plan, to prove generally satisfactory and workable, must be based upon a proper solution of two main questions: (1) To what portions of the people can we address ourselves with the greatest prospects of success, and (2) In what manner and by what means can we best gain their intelligent sympathy and active support for our movement?

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IS A LABOR MOVEMENT.

In attempting to answer these momentous questions, I shall be compelled to go over well-trodden ground, and to review some essential conceptions of Socialist philosophy and tactics. I make no apology for this elementary treatment of the subject. The discussions within our ranks during the last few years show such a confusion of thought that a general stocktaking of our conceptions on tactics and methods can only be clarifying.

I will, therefore, start out by a restatement of the declaration made by every organized Socialist movement since the days of the Communist League, that the Socialists must make their appeal in the first instance to the wage-working class.

This is simply an application of the law of following the line of least resistance. The wage worker has not one motive or interest opposed to the program of Socialism, but on the contrary has every reason for supporting it. Socialism appeals to the egoistic as well as to the altruistic sense of the worker, it satisfies his material as well as his spiritual requirements, and serves his immediate as well as his ultimate interests. To other classes of the people Socialism must be preached, pleaded and apostrophized; to the workers it only has to be explained. In other classes we may convert individuals, the working class we may gain as a whole. We may conceive a Socialist victory in the face of a strong opposition on the part of the "better situated" classes, but a substantial victory of Socialism in the face of active opposition or even passive indifference on the part of the bulk of the laboring classes is quite inconceivable. In fact the Socialist philosophy may properly be designated the social philosophy of the working class, and the entire Socialist movement is primarily a working class movement.

There are those within our movement who consider this conception as too narrow. They regard Socialism primarily as a gospel of social justice and universal brotherhood appealing with equal force to all mankind. They protest against "tainting" this lofty movement with the sordid doctrine of class antagonism and class struggle, and reject the theory that only through the struggles and the victory of the working class as a class, can a higher social order be established.

These good comrades still cling to the primitive and utopian conceptions of Socialism, long discarded by the international Socialist movement, and obstinately refuse to profit by the concrete lessons of our movement in all other countries.

On the other hand, there are the opposite extremists in our ranks: those to whom this conception seems too broad, and who would limit our appeal to only one portion of the working class—the most unskilled, the worst paid and least steadily employed—the "slum proletarians," as they have been aptly termed.

The comrades holding these views argue that only the lowest and most destitute strata of the working class have a just claim to the title of "proletarian," and are alone capable of revolutionary action, while the better situated portions of the workers enjoy comparative material ease to which they are apt to cling and which tends to make them conservative.

This view is as erroneous as that of the purely ethical Socialists and, if possible, even more mischievous. If applied in practice it would result in dividing the ranks of the workers, and in degrading the Socialist movement to the level of a hungry and unintelligent revolt.

The Socialists should strive for the support of the entire working class, i. e., all wage earners employed in industry, commerce and farming, the unskilled and the skilled, the manual and the intellectual workers.

THE ORGANIZED WORKERS ARE THE VANGUARD OF THEIR CLASS.

The same process of reasoning which leads us to lay the greatest emphasis upon propaganda among the working class, points to the organized portion of it as the one

to be approached in the first line. This is not a matter of principle, but one of expediency, as all questions of tactics are. The unorganized workers are scattered and passive, the organized workers are congregated in masses, meeting at definite times and places and, above all, they are actively engaged in a ceaseless and determined struggle against the ruling classes. They are more accessible than their unorganized brothers, they are naturally more susceptible to the gospel of a radical and militant working class movement, and they are a greater and more potent force for our movement, when conquered by the Socialist propaganda.

When I speak of the organized labor movement, I mean the existing movement, and not an imaginary ideal movement which has no real existence to-day. I mean primarily the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor as representing the bulk of organized labor of America, and then the other economic organizations of the workers in the order of their numerical strength.

These workers represent an organized army, two and a half million strong. If imbued with the spirit and intellect of the Socialist movement, they would constitute an almost irresistible social force in this country, and I contend that they can be converted to our cause. Some of our comrades seem to be inclined to abandon all effort to carry the propaganda of Socialism among the "pure and simple" trade or craft unions. They maintain that the leaders of the movement are corrupt and its rank and file reactionary and hopeless for the cause of Socialism. If this were so our movement would be in a sad plight indeed. The trade union movement, next to the Socialist movement, represents the most progressive portion of the workers of the United States, and if these workers were hopeless for Socialism, then Socialism itself would be hopeless in this country. But fortunately the alleged hopelessness of the organized American workers is nothing but a sign of our own impatience and to some extent—our inefficiency. There is nothing organically wrong with the average members of our trade unions; they only lack that breadth of view which the workers of other countries have acquired from their contact with the Socialist movement. And for this defect we are at least as much to blame as they. Partly on account of the weakness of our movement in the past, and partly owing to faulty tactics we have heretofore neglected that kind of patient, systematic and rational work of propaganda among them, which alone could educate them in the Socialist philosophy.

THE MIDDLE CLASSES.

Our principal efforts must thus be directed towards the propaganda of Socialism among the workers. But they should by no means be limited to that class alone. The Socialist movement is a working class movement in the sense that it appeals primarily to the immediate and material interests of the workers and is largely borne and supported by them. But the ultimate aims of the movement far transcend the interests of any one class in society, and its social ideal is so lofty that it may well attract large numbers of men and women from other classes. Furthermore, while wage workers bear the heaviest burden of the capitalist rule, they are by no means the only class which has a direct economic motive for favoring a change of the existing order. The vast majority of the farming population of our country leads a dreary existence of ill-remunerated toil and ceaseless drudgery. It is mortgaged to the money-lenders, exploited by the railroads and controlled by the stock jobbers. Vast masses of the small traders and manufacturers are beginning to realize the hopelessness of their struggle against large capital concentrated in the hands of modern industrial monopolies and trusts, and in the ranks of the professionals the struggle for existence is growing ever fiercer. All these classes would benefit by the proposed Socialist change in our industrial system, and many of them are accessible to our propaganda.

While we should always direct our main efforts towards attracting the workers to our movement, we must not neglect the persons from all other classes and ranks of society whom we may be able to win for our cause. For we need them all. Our struggle is as broad as it is revolutionary—it reaches out to all fields of modern industrial, political, social and intellectual activity. Arrayed against us is not only the direct money power of capital, but also its hosts of trained "statesmen," teachers, preachers and writers, and we must fight them all, and fight them with their own weapons. A movement like ours, which has set out to recast the entire modern social structure, cannot afford to banish the "intellectuals" from its ranks. A Socialist movement consisting exclusively of "Jimmie Higgins" would be as

impotent as such a movement made up entirely or overwhelmingly of "intellectuals" would be preposterous. A well-organized revolutionary movement, like a well-organized army, must be based upon a proper division of functions.

Within very recent years a tendency has manifested itself in some sections of our movement to limit it entirely to wage-workers, and to reject the co-operation of all persons from other classes, no matter how sincere they may be in their professions of Socialist faith and how valuable their services may be for the cause. This is not a rational application of the Marxian class-struggle doctrine, but an absurd caricature of it.

If our propaganda is conducted along proper and rational lines, it will naturally attract more workers than members of the possessing classes, but we cannot increase the number of wage workers in our ranks by closing the doors to the others.

TRADE UNION PROPAGANDA.

If the foregoing general observations are substantially true, then it follows in the first line that the Socialist party must pay greater attention to the propaganda among the organized workers of the country than it has been doing in the past. It must devise a plan of practical and effective work in that field and pursue it systematically and aggressively.

Recent experiments undertaken by the National Executive Committee have shown that a large number of labor unions, even those classed as ultra-conservative, are quite ready to give us a hearing at their meetings. We must avail ourselves of these opportunities to the very utmost extent. Every local organization of the party should make a study of the existing labor organizations within its territory, and should make special efforts to induce them to allow Socialist speakers to address their meetings on appropriate occasions.

Whether we secure a direct hearing before a labor organization or not, we can always manage to distribute Socialist literature among its members at the doors of its meeting place. And this is an even more effective method of propaganda than that of the spoken word. A local of the party may not always have a sufficient number of speakers of the training, skill and tact required to make an impression on an audience of workingmen, but it can always have a plentiful supply of the very best written tracts, leaflets or Socialist papers suitable for the purpose of propaganda among the workers. No doubt some of such literature will be thrown away unread, but some of it will be read, first casually and inattentively, then with ever growing understanding and sympathy. In the long run our message cannot fail to appeal to the workers, if presented intelligently and systematically. We should endeavor to make the distribution of Socialist literature a regular feature of each labor union meeting in the country, and even though we should do nothing else for a few years the Socialist movement would gain tremendously by this work alone.

But more potent even than the propaganda of the work, oral or written, is the propaganda of the deed. We must prove our solidarity with the cause of labor not merely by our assertions and professions but also by our acts and conduct.

The incomplete data recently secured by the National Executive Committee seem to indicate that about twenty thousand party members are also members of trade or labor unions. These men are distributed among all industries, and it is safe to assert that there is hardly an important labor organization which does not have a larger or smaller quota of Socialists among its members. Unfortunately these Socialists have not always done justice to the great opportunities thus offered them. Finding themselves in a small minority, and despairing of the possibility of converting their conservative fellow union-members, they are frequently turning their entire attention to the general propaganda of Socialism and content themselves with passive membership in their unions. This is a grave mistake. The Socialists are as a rule among the most intelligent members of the unions and have broad and sound views on the problems confronting the labor movement from day to day. They should place their intelligence and ability unreservedly at the disposal of their fellow members in the unions. Not by constant criticism nor by the preaching of Socialism in season and out of season, but by steady, capable and unselfish service will the Socialists gain that degree of beneficial influence in the world of organized labor that characterizes our movement in all other countries of the world. We cannot consistently abandon the field to men of conservative views or

doubtful honesty, and then condemn the entire labor movement on account of its unsatisfactory leadership.

While it is very important that Socialists give greater attention to the affairs of their trade organizations, it is a grave mistake for our party or party members as such to attempt to direct the internal affairs of the economic organizations of labor from the outside. We may all prefer the industrial form of organization to the trade or "craft" division, and those of us who are members of trade unions may quite properly advocate "industrialism" within their organizations. But as Socialists we have no reason or justification for taking sides in this purely internal controversy of the economic organizations. If the labor movement becomes imbued with the understanding and spirit of Socialism, it will find a proper form of expression and action, and as long as it remains unenlightened and conservative, a mere different form of organization will not make it revolutionary, class-conscious or progressive. The formation of rival economic organizations of labor will not reform the existing labor movement, and the participation of Socialists in such enterprises will only serve to injure our cause in the eyes of organized labor. The histories of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance and of the Industrial Workers of the World are equal proof of the truth of this assertion.

THE STRUGGLES OF LABOR.

Aside from its daily work and problems, the organized movement often finds itself thrown into acute conflicts with the powers of capital and government. Now it is an extensive and embittered strike, lockout or boycott; now it is a struggle for some important legislative labor measure, or for the protection of existing labor laws from the onslaughts of the courts. It is in such trying and critical times that the organized workers stand most in need of active aid and support, and that aid and support should in all cases come primarily from the Socialists. The struggles of the working class should be our struggles not merely in the broad theoretical interpretation of the process, but in the direct and practical sense of the phrase. We must enter into every important struggle of labor, not solely with the object of making converts to the Socialist philosophy, but with the determination to help them in their concrete fight; in the modest routine work as well as in the work of organization and propaganda.

In this connection I wish to call your special attention to a field of Socialist work in the labor movement which I consider the most favorable and promising at this time—I refer to the movement for the enactment of social labor legislation in the United States.

In every other civilized country of the world the state has formally recognized its social obligations to the working class by the enactment of measures to take care of the sick, injured, disabled and aged worker, and some countries are even evolving systems of insuring their workers against unemployment. In the United States alone the workers are abandoned to their fate in such emergencies. As long as they are young, well and strong and there is a demand for their labor, they may earn enough to keep themselves and their families above the level of destitution, but a serious injury received at work, a protracted illness, a gradual decline in physical strength or a sudden industrial depression will throw them out of the industrial ranks, and mercilessly cast them into the paths of beggary, vagrancy, crime or starvation.

Especially revolting is this condition in cases of industrial injuries. In no country of the world are the employing classes so heedless of the lives and the health of their workers as in the United States; in no country is the industrial slaughter of workers so shockingly regular and extensive. Hundreds of workers are killed and thousands are maimed and injured every week in our mines, mills and factories and on our railroads and buildings. And our Christian community practically punishes these unfortunate victims of modern industrial warfare by withdrawing from them and their dependents the means of bare subsistence. For under our archaic and iniquitous system of law and procedure the injured worker and the dependents of the worker killed in his occupation have no claim upon the community and practically no redress against the employers. The Employers' Liability laws of all states are so monstrously partial to the employer, the process of litigation is so slow, costly and involved, the courts are so prejudiced against the working class, and the accident insurance companies, feeding upon the misfortunes of the injured workers, are so crafty and unscrupulous, that in the vast majority of cases

the injured workmen and their dependents are defeated in their claims for compensation.

The evils of the present Employers' Liability laws are so crying and the contrast with the laws of other countries is so glaring, that even the long enduring American workers are beginning to murmur, and our legislatures are being forced to turn their attention to the vital problem.

A Workmen's Compensation Act is at this time before the United States Congress; in the States of New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota legislative commissions have been appointed to examine the subject; similar movements are springing up in almost all other industrial states, and the agitation is bound to grow tremendously within the next few years.

The workers of this country, while they are almost a unit in their opposition to the present so-called Employers' Liability laws, offer no effective and uniform remedy and have no definite program of action. They need guidance, cohesion and support. Here is our task and our opportunity. In all other countries the Socialists have been in the van of every movement for social labor legislation. The American Socialists must perform the same duties for the workers of this country. The Socialist party should draft a comprehensive and concrete bill providing for compensation to all workers injured in their occupations or to their survivors, such compensation to be equal to the full economic loss caused by the injury or death, to be adjusted quasi-automatically, without the intervention of courts or lawyers, and to be definite, swift and certain in all cases. The measure should be uniform for all states, and our party should everywhere assume the initiative of the movement in co-operation with the local labor organizations. The movement is of such immediate and vital importance to the workers that they cannot fail to rally to it with earnestness and enthusiasm as the recent experiment of the New York Socialists has amply demonstrated.

Let this proposition not be waved aside as paltry and unworthy of our efforts. To the millions of workers facing death or disablement in their occupations every day, it is a matter of very deep concern, hence it can not be a matter of indifference to us. Furthermore, the fight for one general and radical reform measure, and the lessons and experiences of such a fight, must inevitably lead the working class of America into larger and more important struggles and open newer and broader social vistas to it. But above all it will serve to unite Socialism and labor in common struggle and bring about that unity among them which is so essential to the success of both.

GENERAL PROPAGANDA.

The special work of labor union propaganda as outlined above should, of course, not be considered in the light of a substitute for the general propaganda as heretofore carried on by the Socialist party, but rather as an addition to it. Our efforts to carry the message of Socialism to the people as a whole should be vigorously continued, but that propaganda should be conducted on somewhat more rational and economical lines than in the past. Above all, we must discard show and demonstration for system and thoroughness, and the revolutionary phrase for revolutionary action.

Street meetings, which at present probably absorb the greater part of our energies, no doubt have their legitimate place in the economy of the Socialist propaganda, but I fear their importance is frequently overestimated. Time was when Socialism was so little known or heeded in this country that any device to attract public notice to the mere existence of our movement was in itself an effective mode of propaganda. That time has passed. The Socialist movement has become an established and recognized factor in the United States. Our task to-day is not to proclaim that we exist, but to enlighten our fellow citizens on the aims and objects for which we exist. Our street meetings as well as our hall meetings must be truly educational in their nature and effect. Our speakers on the soap box and on the lecture platform must be well prepared for their task, and above all the meetings must in every case be made the occasion for a thorough distribution of literature. Meetings hastily arranged, especially street meetings, with unprepared speakers and not accompanied by distribution of Socialist literature, are often useless and worse.

And here again, as in the case of our special work among labor unions, the propaganda by literature must be accorded the first place. A good speech may provoke emotion or incite to thought, but its effect is limited to the direct hearer and may

be weakened or obliterated by time. A good book or leaflet can be read and re-read and may be passed on to others. To our literature, its quality and methods of its circulation we must, therefore, turn our first attention.

Heretofore there has been but little system in this matter. Books on Socialism are published by the scores. They may be sound or unsound, useful or useless, appropriate or inappropriate—their sale or circulation depends in every case very largely upon the enterprise or advertising ability of the publisher or author. Booklets and leaflets are issued indiscriminately by the National Office, State organizations, locals of the party, private publishers and individuals. Most often they are duplications and restatements of the same proposition. They are good, bad or indifferent, and are distributed indiscriminately or often allowed to pile up in the headquarters of the locals.

This system, or rather, lack of system, must be changed. In the matter of books we should limit ourselves to a few works covering the main aspects of our philosophy and movement. We should select those most accurately representing the attitude of the international Socialist movement and written in most popular and intelligible style. These books should be on sale at all of our public meetings and we should otherwise promote their circulation. Of course, they will not exhaust the subject of Socialism. But if we can induce a person to read a few fundamental works on Socialism, we may safely leave it to his judgment to continue his own studies along the general lines of Socialist education.

The publication of pamphlets and leaflets should be assumed by the National Office, and the best qualified writers within our ranks should be secured by the latter for their preparation. The pamphlets and leaflets should be few in number, but each one should serve a definite purpose. Thus, we may have one booklet containing a brief and lucid outline of the aims and methods of our movement, one booklet for special labor union propaganda, one for special propaganda among farmers, etc. Upon the happening of any event of national significance or the springing up of any new popular movement, the National Office should at once issue a special leaflet giving the Socialist view on the subject.

All such pamphlets and leaflets should be sold to the locals at cost, and the latter should train their members to distribute them regularly and carefully. Every local in the country should set apart at least one day in the month for a general distribution of Socialist literature.

MOVEMENTS FOR LIBERTY AND PROGRESS.

While the Socialist party is primarily the champion of the cause of labor, its function is not confined to that role. As the only truly progressive political party of the country it is of necessity the main guardian of the purity and democracy of our institutions and of all true civic rights and liberties. Even in the countries of Europe in which there are still some survivals of the old-time political liberals and radicals the task of defending the personal liberties of the citizens and the civic and political integrity of the nations is falling more and more upon the Socialists. In the United States, which the two dominant parties are equally reactionary and corrupt, and the so-called reform parties appear only as spasmodic and comic side shows in politics, that task is left almost exclusively to the Socialists.

The Socialists must be in the van of all struggles against reaction and corruption and must lead in all movements for social justice and progress.

Whether it be a movement to curb the powers of that tyrannical American oligarchy, the United States Supreme Court, or a movement for disarmament and international peace, or a struggle against infringement on the rights of free speech, press or assemblage, or any other act of oppression or corruption, the Socialists should make such struggles their own, and throw the entire weight of their organization and propaganda into them. The fair-minded and progressive Americans of all classes should learn to regard the Socialists as the unfailing champions of liberty and progress.

One of the foremost movements of our time is the struggle of woman for her enfranchisement. It is a very concrete and vital movement for social justice and progress, and is gaining in strength and momentum every year. In the United States it has passed the stage of a mere theory. It has become a problem to be faced and solved in the immediate future.

The modern Socialist movement began its political career with a demand for

equal political rights for all adults, without distinction of class or sex, and the platform of our own party contains a specific pledge that the Socialists of America would engage in an active campaign for unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women. This pledge was made in good faith and must be redeemed unequivocally and whole-heartedly. Our propaganda for the enfranchisement of women must be carried on, not spasmodically and perfunctorily, but steadily and enthusiastically. We must allow no opportunity for such propaganda to escape. Whether it be a legislative hearing, a public demonstration or discussion, the Socialists should range themselves on all occasions with the advocate of woman suffrage.

In this country there is practically no movement for qualified suffrage. The American woman suffrage movement as a whole stands for full political rights for women, regardless of class and property qualifications. There is, therefore, less reason for us to conduct a separate campaign upon this issue than there is for our comrades in Europe, where the suffrage movement is to some extent conducted on class lines. While the Socialist party should never merge its identity in any other movement, we should not place ourselves in a voluntary position of isolation, where the principles and aims of our party fully coincide with those of other organizations. We should heartily support the general movement of the women of America for their enfranchisement. In this case, as in many similar cases, Socialism must break through the narrow circle of our own organization and must penetrate into the masses of the people as a living and vivifying social force.

PROPAGANDA AMONG THE YOUNG.

Among the special fields of Socialist propaganda the education of our boys and girls to an understanding of the Socialist philosophy is one of the most important. The ultimate battles of Socialism will largely be fought by the growing generation, and we must begin early to train the latter for its part. The Socialists of Europe have long appreciated the importance of the task, and in almost every country they have built up a strong organization of young people. The Socialists of America are just beginning to turn their attention to the problem.

The problem is as delicate as it is important, and should be handled with as much intelligence as zeal.

At what age should the Socialist training of the child begin and by what methods should it be conducted? Our public system of education is calculated to imbue the unformed and plastic mind of the child with the notions of the dominant class, and to develop in it an individualistic and capitalistic attitude towards life and life's struggles. This system takes hold of our children in their infancy and clings to them until they have reached the age of maturity. We must meet these malignant influences at all stages, but we must carefully adapt our methods to the intelligence of the child at the different ages. The child of tender years may well be taught to value the social spirit and co-operative efforts in life, but it is incapable of grasping the philosophy and true meaning of the class struggle, and it is dangerous to train it in the use of a phraseology which to its immature mind can be nothing but a meaningless formula. The teaching of infants is a task which requires a good deal of professional training, and no Socialist "Sunday Schools" for very young children should be established where we do not have experienced and reliable teachers to conduct them. The mind of the child is too sacred to be made the object of rough experiments, and Socialist Sunday Schools conducted with insufficient skill or method, often do more harm than good.

It is quite otherwise with children of the maturer age of, say, fourteen years and upward. Young people of that age normally possess sufficient strength of mind to grasp the main philosophy and aims of our movement intelligently, and their training into the Socialist mode of thought and action cannot be conducted with too much zeal and energy. Young people's clubs and societies for the study of Socialism should be formed all over the country as regular adjuncts to our party organization, and very serious consideration should be given to them by the adult Socialists. But they should remain primarily study clubs, and should not be encouraged to engage in practical political activity, which can do but little good to our movement, and may tend to arrest the intelligent growth of the youthful enthusiasts. When they will reach a maturer age they will be better and more efficient workers in the movement for having made a more thorough study of its theory and methods.

In this connection attention should be called to the propaganda of Socialism in our high schools and colleges. The students in these institutions are not all, not even in their majority, the children of the wealthy classes. More often they come from poor parents, who submit to privations in the fond hope that a higher education would give their offspring an advantage in the struggle for existence. The bulk of these students face the uncertain future of professionals or salaried employees. They are destined to swell the ranks of the growing modern class of "intellectual proletarians." They have all the idealism and enthusiasm of youth, and are more susceptible to the propaganda of Socialism than men of their class hardened and rendered skeptical and cynical by life's battles. The Intercollegiate Socialist Society is doing good and fruitful work among them, and the party should actively support and encourage the movement.

PROPAGANDA AMONG THE "FOREIGNERS."

Another field of work which, I believe, has been somewhat neglected by our party, is the propaganda of Socialism among the non-English speaking residents of this country.

The "American people" are after all a nation of immigrants. We count our "Americanism" by a very few generations, and the "foreign" population has always played an important part in the industrial and political life of the country. At this time there are over ten million foreign-born persons in the United States. Most of them are workers, and most of them still speak, write and read in their native tongues.

The powers of capital, through their political and so-called educational agencies, and often with the aid of the churches, are constantly at work prejudicing them against Socialism and arraying them against organized labor.

The Socialists must make energetic efforts to counteract these baneful influences and to reach the foreign workers with their propaganda.

The Socialist party has branch organizations among all, or almost all, of these nationalities, and a few of these organizations have reached a high degree of strength and a large measure of influence among the people of their nationalities. But many more of them are weak in numbers and inefficient in their activity.

These organizations work under conditions different from those of the party as a whole. In each case they deal with a special type of persons, of a psychology and of economic conditions peculiarly their own, and they are the most competent judges of the methods of propaganda best suitable to their own countrymen. The party should allow such non-English speaking organizations the greatest freedom of action, and should assist them in every way in their special work of Socialist propaganda.

SPECIALIZATION AND CO-OPERATION.

The above suggestions, numerous and lengthy as they may be, do not pretend to constitute a complete program of the practical propaganda work of the Socialist party. I have endeavored to sketch merely the rough outlines of such a program, and to discuss some of its salient points. The party as such must have a general plan of action, and its officers and committees must have instructions from the members on the methods of work to be followed by them. But, of course, no general program can be made binding in its entirety upon all state and local organizations and still less upon the individual members of the party. Each local organization must fashion its actions with a sensible regard to the conditions of the place and the population. It would be folly to insist on special labor union propaganda in a purely agricultural district and vice versa. Nor could each individual member be expected to follow all the lines of propagandist activity mentioned in this report. Our members are men and women of different inclinations, training and gifts. Some are best suited by temperament and ability to do one special line of work in the general field of Socialist propaganda and organization, and others, another. This is but natural and proper. Ours is an age of specialization, and the complex Socialist movement requires specialists in all branches of its work. We need the theoreticians and the practical workers; the propagandists and the organizers; those who emphasize the importance of present-day reforms on the lines of the Socialist program, and those who dwell by preference on the ultimate aims of our movement; those who do a little in every line of party work, and those who devote themselves entirely to

one chosen specialty, and only through the harmonious co-operation of all these divergent activities within the party, will the party itself become strong and influential. Unfortunately our members are sometimes inclined to consider the activity which appeals most strongly to their individual bent of mind and temperament as the only legitimate and useful work of Socialism, and to deprecate all other work as senseless and harmful. This irrational attitude is largely responsible for much of the acrimonious discussion and paralyzing factionalism within our ranks. It is a sign of the immaturity of our movement, and the sooner we learn to respect and tolerate each other's work, views and inclinations, the better for the movement as a whole.

At no time in the history of our country have the opportunities for the Socialist movement been as great as they are just at this moment. The labor movement is in a state of unrest and expectancy—it is rapidly approaching the turning point of its career. Both old parties are demoralized and the spurious reform movements which have been haunting our politics of late years are thoroughly discredited. The only thing required to assure to the Socialist movement a steady, rapid and healthy rise in this country is a systematic, rational and harmonious propaganda work. We should be false to ourselves and false to our trust if we failed to discharge this supreme duty to our party and our cause.

PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

In the practical work of Socialist propaganda, general principles often remain sterile unless they are reduced to a concrete and definite program of action, and my suggestions would not be complete without specific recommendations for such a program.

Our party organization consists of local subdivisions supplemented by state and national committees. The locals are the working organs of the party, and in the last instance the success of the Socialist propaganda in this country will depend upon the work of the locals. It is therefore of the utmost importance to devise some means by which their attention will be constantly directed to the more important branches of that propaganda. As one of such means I suggest that the local party organizations in every city, town and locality have separate standing committees on Education, Literature, Labor Union Propaganda, Public Affairs, and Organizations. These committees should specialize themselves in their respective spheres, and keep in constant touch with the state and national organizations, as well as with the members of their own locals.

With a machinery adapted to all practical requirements of our movement, we will be less apt to neglect our duties and opportunities.

But of greater practical interest to this Congress is the work of the national office and committees of the party. We can only make recommendations for the work of the locals; we can directly prescribe and regulate the work and policies of our national office.

Our National Executive Committee can accomplish but little in the field of direct and independent propaganda. It is not equipped for such work, nor do I believe that it was intended to charge it with that task. The regular, annual income of the national office from membership dues is about \$25,000. The regular operating expenses and fixed charges of the national office, such as rent, salaries, postage, expressage and printing, foot up to about \$15,000, thus leaving about \$10,000 per year for purposes of organization and propaganda.

If we bear in mind that our party consists of over 3,000 locals, and that the cost of each organizer and lecturer to the national office is about three dollars per day in the average, we will realize the futility of attempting to carry on the work of independent general organization and propaganda from the national office.

In the present condition of our party the National Executive Committee should undertake the direct work of Socialist propaganda only on special occasions and should be charged with the systematic work of organization only in such states in which our movement is as yet practically unorganized. With reference to the organized movement, its main function should be to guide and co-ordinate the work of the state and local organizations of the party. It should provide them with timely and appropriate propaganda literature, arrange cross-country lecture tours for the state organizations at the expense of the latter, and maintain at its own expense as many organizers as it can afford, primarily for work in the unorganized territories

and in the labor unions. As soon as a special event of importance should occur in any part of the country calling for immediate action on our part, such as an extensive strike, a struggle against an attack upon the civic liberties of the people, or any progressive popular movement, the National Secretary should be in a position to send some or all of such organizers to the place of battle without loss of time. These organizers would in such cases be of great value to the movement, not only on account of their personal work, but also, and perhaps more so, on account of the general experience which they will have gained in such struggles and which will enable them to organize the local Socialists for effective support of such struggles.

I, therefore, recommend:

1. That the National Executive Committee be directed to publish periodically propaganda booklets, tracts and leaflets on the general subject of the aims and methods of the Socialist movement, as well as upon special phases of the latter, notably its bearing upon the struggles of labor and other progressive social movements, and upon the most important events and conditions arising in the industrial, political and social life of the country. Such booklets, tracts and leaflets, as well as all other literature on Socialism, to be handled by the National Literature Bureau, and to be sold to the local and state organizations as nearly as possible at cost. The National Secretary shall be authorized to place the work of the Literature Bureau in charge of a special assistant who shall give his whole time to the work.

2. That the National Executive Committee be authorized to employ special lecturers for the propaganda of Socialism among the labor unions, and special organizers for the purpose of aiding all extraordinary struggles and movements in which the support of the party may be proper.

All restrictions as to the compensation of such special lecturers and organizers and as to their right to enter the territories of organized states shall be removed.

3. That the Official Monthly Bulletin be converted into an organ for the furtherance of the propaganda of Socialism. All important official reports and announcements to be published in brief and concise form, all personal correspondence and matters of trivial routine to be eliminated, and the greater part of the space in the Bulletin to be given to accounts of the more important propaganda work of the national, state and local organizations, and to the discussion of new and effective methods of propaganda.

Fraternally submitted,
MORRIS HILLQUIT.

DEL. HILLQUIT then read the report on propaganda. After reading the following paragraph:

"A Workmen's Compensation Act is at this time before the United States Congress; in the states of New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota legislative commissions have been appointed to examine the subject," he said:

Here let me state parenthetically what I meant by this reference to the experience of the New York Socialists. In New York, as you may know, the governor appointed a commission to investigate the workings of employer's liability laws, and to propose changes or amendments, if required. The Trades Unionists took it up, and formed a joint committee from all the central bodies in the greater city. The Socialists, as too often happens, neglected their opportunities until the last hour. Then they woke up about it and elected a committee to co-operate with organized labor for the enactment of legislation, and the passage of the

compensation act. The comrades who were elected went to work and studied the question, drafted a somewhat imperfect plan of a compensation act, but the best they could suggest under the circumstances, appeared before the commission at the public hearing, and urged the passage of their act. The impression that they made upon the representatives of organized labor who happened to be present was so favorable that that very same day a coalition was formed, the Socialists were officially admitted to the joint conference with organized labor and within the three or four months that we have been working with them, we actually succeeded in gaining the entire confidence of the organized labor of New York. Now, if you know the conditions, if you know the conservative character of organized labor in New York, if you know anything about the relations of the unions in New York to the Socialist Party, you will know that this indicates practically a revolution in our relations with them. They received us with some

misgiving, some suppressed feeling of distrust, but as we went on working with them, sitting down with them, discussing point after point, without making propaganda speeches on every point, but just taking up the business before us, they gradually began to see that the Socialists, after all, know what they are talking about, and ever since that time in every important move, in a demonstration or a hearing, or otherwise, they always put the Socialists to the front. At the legislative hearing some members of the commission, including our friend, John Mitchell, taunted them with it, and they said to the workers, "You have become dissatisfied and radical because you are under the influence of the Socialists," and these conservative trades unionists got up and said, "We are proud of it." This is the way they answered that taunt. The Trades Unions of New York have called a convention for the 25th of this month for the sole purpose of discussing and acting upon this proposed compensation act. The legislature gave them a law which is an abortion in every way, and the workers have learned enough from their contact with us to reject it with scorn and to demand a true, live, comprehensive compensation act. In that convention the Socialists will be represented; Socialists have been selected as speakers, the Socialists will be very large in the management of the entire affair, there probably will be a couple of hundred trades unions represented through delegates.

Now that, comrades, is the result of only about three months' work carried on by a handful of Socialist comrades in New York. It has shown us at least one thing: that in practical agitation it is the easiest thing in the world for the Socialists and the representatives of the Socialist Party to come into close contact with the working men, and to acquire that position of intellectual leadership in the labor movement which our comrades in other countries have won long ago.

Del. Hillquit then continued the reading of his report. While reading the paragraph on "Specialization and Co-operation," he said:

If you coolly analyze those phrases that we have coined of late: the impossibilist, the direct actionist, the non-actionist, and ask what they mean, you will find that they practically stand in most cases for some particular in-

dividual and perfectly legitimate inclination of a certain member or group of members, and instead of recognizing that each member may follow his own inclination so long as he remains within the scope of the Socialist propaganda, that he should be encouraged to engage in that line of work which he can do the best, we say that the man who does work which is socialistic work, but does not appeal to me, is an impossibilist or an opportunist.

Delegate Hillquit then concluded the reading of his report. After reading the first recommendation, he said:

I here desire to insert a second recommendation, not printed in this report, at the suggestion of Local New York:

2. That the National Office furnish the labor papers free with plate service presenting the Socialist position to the trade union papers for the purpose of offsetting the anti-socialist articles furnished to the labor press by the civic federation and other organizations.

A motion was made and seconded that the report and recommendations be accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report and recommendations.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I am opposed to the acceptance of the report at this time, for the reason that the National Woman's Committee has been working directly amongst the women upon the woman question for two years past, and our report has not been read, has not been heard by this congress, and the acceptance of Comrade Hillquit's report in its entirety would cut out any possible changes which the woman's committee may wish to make, and in fairness to the woman's committee I request the holding over of this report until after the reading of our report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will state for the benefit of the delegates that the preliminary matter in this report does not affect any committee that exists and that the only matter that might affect them is contained in the recommendations; and that the proper course would be to receive the report and then act on the recommendations seriatim; and that would in no way affect the woman's committee or any other committee. I therefore accept the motion that has been made to receive the report, and that the recommendations be acted on seriatim.

DEL. HURST (R. I.): Would that preclude the offering of resolutions on propaganda?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. O'HARE (Kans.): A point of information. In the recommendation as to the National Bulletin, I would like to ask the chairman if he has any recommendations as to how that bulletin is going to get into the hands of the membership. I find that it is principally used as shelf paper, and it is decidedly expensive shelf paper. I would like to have some information on that subject.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will state that when these various recommendations come up in their order, matters pertaining to them may then be considered. My proposition now is, that we get into a parliamentary position where we can proceed in order. Let us not make any unnecessary speeches. If the report of the committee is received and the various recommendations are to be brought up seriatim, then the various phases of these various matters can be discussed and questions asked.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): At this moment, if it would be in order, I should like to introduce a resolution which would be an addition to the recommendations of the committee and would, I believe, be Number 5 of the recommendations.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made to add another recommendation.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I will adopt that.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Since we have no committee on propaganda as we ought to have, I move you that Number 2 and Number 3 be referred to the Committee on Constitution, because they pertain to constitutional changes; and Number 1 ought to go to the Committee on Resolutions, where it can be changed somewhat, and then adopted. I think we ought to have these matters before us in proper concrete shape.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will not receive this motion for this reason, because the question is on receiving the report and taking up the recommendations seriatim; and when these recommendations are reached in their order, they can be referred to the proper committee by motion made at that time. This motion is entirely anticipatory.

DEL. BERGER: I will vote for the motion to receive it, but nothing else. You have no right to put a double motion in that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first part is, that the report be received; that amounts to nothing; and then consider the recommendations seriatim. Those in favor of receiving the report and acting upon the recommendations seriatim say aye.

The motion was declared carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first recommendation is before you as read.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I want to say as one member of the Committee on Constitution, that each one of these recommendations is covered in some way by the report of the Committee on Constitution.

Moved and seconded that the three recommendations, first read, be referred to the Committee on Constitution.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): Perhaps I have these last recommendations more clearly in mind. They are:

The congress strongly advises all state and local organizations of the party to give careful study to the subject of workmen's compensation laws, to train a corps of speakers and writers qualified to deal with the subject, and to inaugurate a systematic and persistent campaign for the enactment of such laws and for their improvement in any cases where they may be enacted in an unsatisfactory form.

The congress instructs the National Executive Committee to assume the duty of correlating the efforts of the various state and local organizations on this line, assisting them in the collection and exchange of information, the training of speakers and writers, the publication and distribution of literature, so as to give the movement a nation wide scope.

The congress invites the labor unions of all trades and industries to join with the party in the prosecution of this work, and urges the party organizations in every industrial center to enter into conference with the local central labor bodies for that purpose.

These recommendations were overlooked and Comrade Hillquit has accepted them as the fifth recommendation.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I am very much afraid that Comrade Berger's experience as alderman-at-large has demoralized him somewhat. He seems to think that nothing can be done except through a committee. I don't see the necessity or economy of sending this to a committee only to come back for action again. I think these recom-

mendations which follow the report are ready for discussion and I think they can be fully disposed of at the present time. We gain absolutely nothing, and we double our work, if we refer this to committees to be reported back to be discussed and acted upon again. I think, comrades, whether you agree or disagree with these recommendations, you should express yourselves directly. There is just the last paragraph of section three that affects the work of the Committee on Constitution, and they can take that and put it in proper form and language and embody it in the constitution; but as to the rest, they constitute one whole or series of recommendations as to propaganda on which we are now ready to act. We either accept them or reject them, but we gain absolutely nothing by putting them in cold storage and then getting them back from the committee and start discussing them over again from the beginning.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): At the Borough meeting of Kings County I was instructed to bring up something like this and with one exception Comrade Hillquit's report and recommendations largely cover what we wanted to do. It is necessary to make a motion, but I want to precede the motion with a few remarks. In the Borough of Kings we suffer from lack of speakers and we find a great necessity of a report of statistics being published once a month, so that the speakers may have them and keep posted, so that no one from the audience can throw them down. The proposition from the Borough of Kings is that a monthly bulletin of statistics be published, and that some one be engaged for that purpose, not only to publish the statistics, but to index the statistics, so that they can be readily referred to, giving the authorities from which the statistics are secured, like killing working people on railroads, explosions in mines, so as to keep up to date the statistical propaganda among young speakers.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): For the resolutions committee I want to say that all of these were before that committee last night and acted upon favorably, and so far as we are concerned I do not see why you could not act upon them right now.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I entirely disagree with Comrade Hillquit and agree with Comrade Berger. Anything pertaining to the Executive Committee

is a matter to be considered by the Committee on Constitution, and the other matter should go to the resolutions committee, and inasmuch as there are various propositions along this same line which will be offered, they should all be referred to the committees and then let them work out some programme and present it to the congress, and then you can decide upon them as a whole here and not take each one and decide it piecemeal without regard to the others. There is no necessity of occupying time in that manner. In order to facilitate matters, anything relating to the constitution should be at once referred to the Committee on Constitution, and anything pertaining properly to resolutions should be referred to that committee. Then we will have order. Then we can pass on the various propositions presented clearly and understandingly.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I want to call your attention to the constitution of the National Socialist Party. The recommendations of Comrade Hillquit, the first three, are now covered by the national constitution. The others will be covered in the new constitution and that covers it all.

DEL. M'DERMOTT (Mont.): I don't believe I care to vote on that matter until I know what other matters will be brought before us in relation to the constitution. I don't think it is fair to ask us to vote on these propositions until we know all that will be before us and know all that will come after, and some of which may conflict.

The motion to refer was then put and declared carried as to recommendation 1, which was referred to the Committee on Constitution.

On motion, recommendations 2 and 3 were referred to the Committee on Constitution.

On motion, recommendation 4 was referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Number 4 refers to the monthly bulletin.

DEL. GOEBEL: I move that we reconsider and that it be sent to the Committee on Constitution.

The motion was carried unanimously.

On motion, recommendation 5 was sent to the Committee on Resolutions.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I wish to present this written motion: "That a Committee on Congressional Programme, to consist of nine members, be chosen by this congress to report a

programme for this year's congressional campaign, the same to be submitted to the party referendum after action by the congress. The programme shall state among other matters the attitude of the party nationally relative to these subjects: Unemployment, Industrial Compensation, Conservation, Hunger Tariff, International Peace and Judicial Usurpation."

On motion, this was referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair has a resolution sent by Local Aberdeen, as follows: "That the National Executive Committee shall institute a special national committee, composed of members residing in practically every state, such members to be Socialists and members of some union. This committee shall, as far as they can without pay, investigate all matters wherein the party may co-operate with unions economically, and wherein unions may be induced to accept our political programme; this committee shall advise the National Executive Committee in all such matters, but shall have no executive authority."

On motion, this was referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the Committee on Immigration is next in order.

DEL. STREBEL: The tellers are ready to report on the election of the Committee on Government by Commission. The figures are as follows: Jacobsen, 55; Thompson, 51; Rose, 45; Branstetter, 43; McLevy, 43; Collins, 42; Osborne, 33; Royal 14, Hutchisson, 13. The following therefore are elected to serve on this committee: Jacobsen, Thompson, Rose, Branstetter and McLevy.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the tellers. If there is no objection, I declare the five first named elected to said committee. The next business is the report of the Committee on Immigration and I shall receive the report of the majority of the committee. Delegate Wanhope will speak for the majority.

Delegate Wanhope then read the majority report of the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION.

The Socialist party aims to realize a system of society in which economic class distinctions, the foundation of all other class distinctions shall no longer exist, and in which all human beings without regard to nationality or race shall have equal opportunities as members of the industrial army of the world.

In the struggle for the realization of our social ideals it is the duty of the Socialist party to combat vigorously all those tendencies of the capitalist system which weaken the working classes of the different countries in their struggle for emancipation, and to promote and accelerate all those tendencies which increase their power of resistance, raise their standard of living and facilitate the organization and propaganda of the most militant and intelligent portions of the working class.

We recognize, however, that our present decaying capitalistic system generates many contradictory phases and antagonisms which at times compel the Socialist movement in its efforts to conform its acts to the present and immediate interests of the working class, to come into apparent conflict with its ultimate ideals. This, however, is an unavoidable condition of the general law of social progress. We work toward our ultimate ideals through and despite these apparent contradictions. We recognize with Marx that the progress of working class emancipation does not proceed uniformly and by identical methods in all countries, but that the working class of each nation will have first to settle matters with its own ruling class before absolute international working class solidarity can be realized.

The general question of Immigration and Emigration with its multitude of conflicting elements falls clearly into the category of contradictions referred to above. In a conflict between ultimate ideals and immediate class interests, the law of self-government asserts itself above all ultimate ideals. The Socialist Party in its present activities cannot outrun the general development of the working class, but must keep step with it. We agree with the statement of the *Communist Manifesto* that the Socialists "fight for the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the immediate interests of the working class," and that precisely "in the movement of the present we also represent and take care of the future" of our movement.

In advocating the policy of restricted immigration, or even the exclusion of

specific races, we are not necessarily in contradiction with the essential principles of solidarity of the working class. On the contrary, we are convinced that this policy may, under some conditions, and especially under present conditions in the United States, be the most effective means of promoting the ultimate realization of international and inter-racial solidarity.

We agree with the conclusions of the International Congress at Stuttgart to the effect that "Immigration and Emigration of workingmen are phenomena as inseparable from the substance of capitalism as unemployment, over-production and under-consumption of the working man, and that they are frequently one of the means to reduce the share of the working men in the product of labor, and that they at times assume abnormal dimensions through political, religious and national persecution."

Also we thoroughly endorse the statement of the same body that "it is the duty of organized working men to protect themselves against the lowering of the standard of life which frequently results from the mass import of unorganized working men."

We believe that this statement applies with peculiar force to conditions in the United States. If it be admitted that the working class of each nation has first to settle matters with its own ruling class; if it be furthermore admitted that by defending the immediate interests of the working class we are taking care of the ultimate ideals of the future; and if it be finally admitted that the principle of national autonomy prevents the International Congresses of the Socialist Party from laying down specific rules for the carrying out of the general principles recognized as valid by all Socialists: then we may well cede the right of the International Congress to declare that it "sees no proper solution of these difficulties in the exclusion of definite races and nations from immigration," and nevertheless deny that an opposite policy is necessarily "in conflict with the principle of proletarian solidarity."

For this reason we are convinced that we are fully justified in endorsing every demand and position taken by the International Congress in its resolution on Immigration, with the exception of those passages which refer to specific restriction or to the exclusion of definite races or nations.

We do not believe that such measures are necessarily "fruitless and reactionary" as stated by the International Congress, but on the contrary are convinced that any measures which do not conform to the immediate interests of the working class in the United States are fruitless and reactionary.

Such a measure or measures would place the Socialist Party in opposition to the most militant and intelligent portion of the organized workers of the United States, those whose assistance is indispensable to the purpose of elevating the Socialist Party to political power.

We have no special recommendations to make that would enlarge upon the general position on Immigration and Emigration taken by the International Congress in its Stuttgart resolutions. But the present conditions compel us to make an important exception in the matter of exclusion of immigrants from specific and definite nations. This exception refers altogether to the mass immigration of Chinese, Japanese, Coreans and Hindus to the United States. We advocate the unconditional exclusion of these races, not as races *per se*—not as peoples with definite physiological characteristics—but for the evident reason that these peoples occupy definite portions of the earth in which they are so far behind the general modern development of industry, psychologically as well as economically, that they constitute a drawback, an obstacle and menace to the progress of the most aggressive, militant and intelligent elements of our working class population.

The larger and more powerful elements of our ruling classes, the great capitalists, the real and effective opponents of the militant working class, are the real beneficiaries of immigration from those countries, and being well aware that these immigrants are accustomed to a much lower standard of living and do not easily assimilate with the other elements of our population, use every means, legal and illegal, to encourage the immigration of these peoples to a point where it becomes an effective competitor against the progressive elements of the working class, serves to lower their standard of living, and constitutes a formidable factor in perpetuating division among the workers by subordinating class issues to racial antagonisms and thus tends to prolong the system of capitalistic exploitation. For this reason the exclusion laws already on the statute books are not only not enforced, but are made

largely inoperative by the influence of the powerful interests which desire that this immigration shall continue.

It is true that this legislation was passed mainly by the influence of the middle class in its vain struggle to avoid political and economic extinction, but it has so happened that this legislation promotes the interests of the working class rather than those of its originators.

The exclusion of the above-mentioned peoples does not prevent the disintegration of the middle classes, but it does, on the other hand, assist the workers by lessening unemployment, maintaining the standard of living, minimizing the number of possible strike-breakers and lessening the various race problems which tend to confuse and divert the working class in its struggle for final emancipation.

In view of the already existing race problem bequeathed to this country by former chattel slavery, every mass immigration of the peoples referred to tends to add to and intensify race issues and relegate the class war to the rear by weakening the political and economic labor organizations and substituting an Asiatic middle class with a lower standard of living than the American. The continuity of such mass immigration would undoubtedly prolong the life of capitalism in this country and constitute a most formidable factor in retarding and relegating to the far distant future the realization of our social ideals.

Just as emphatically as we insist on the exclusion of the races named above, so we on the other hand insist that our position shall not be construed as applicable to those immigrants of other races and nations who have behind them a long history of faithful service in the struggle of the working class and which contain most valuable revolutionary elements much needed here in our common conflict with the exploiting classes.

Especially does this exception refer to immigrant laws from all countries, who, through long centuries of association, not only in struggles against race oppression, but in the general labor struggle, have become an integral and essential part in the world's revolutionary forces.

Also, it is to be distinctly understood that we are in full agreement with the position taken by the International Congresses which demand freedom of immigration and emigration for political refugees, regardless of their race or nationality.

The Committee has arrived at this conclusion after several years of careful study of all available data. So far as the time limits of this convention permit, individual members of this Committee are prepared to state the general and specific reasons that have led them to the position taken in this report.

We would, however, call attention to the fact that an enormous amount of data has been accumulated on this question, an amount which precludes the presentation of anything more than a general conclusion. We would recommend, in addition, that this mass of data be arranged systematically, with a view to publication in book form for the education of the party membership on this complicated and important question.

Finally, we recommend the continuation of this committee with the same members, or others, as the Convention may decide, for the general opinion of this Committee is that this question is in no sense exhausted, and that new and peculiar phases of it appear from year to year which imperatively demand attention.

ERNEST UNTERMANN, *Chairman.*

VICTOR BERGER,

JOSHUA WANHOPE.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the majority report. There is a minority report, which will now be presented by Comrade Spargo.

Comrade Spargo then read the minority report of the committee as follows:

MINORITY REPORT ON IMMIGRATION.

At the International Socialist Con-

gress held at Stuttgart in 1908 the following resolution upon the subject of immigration was adopted:

"Immigration and emigration of workingmen are phenomena as inseparable from the substance of capitalism as unemployment, overproduction and underconsumption of the workingmen; they are frequently one of the means to reduce the share of the workingmen in the product of labor, and at times they

assume abnormal dimensions through political, religious and national persecutions.

"The congress does not consider exception measures of any kind, economic or political, the means for removing any danger which may arise to the working class from immigration and emigration, since such measures are fruitless and reactionary, especially not the restriction of the freedom of emigration and the exclusion of foreign nations and races.

"At the same time the congress declares it to be the duty of organized workingmen to protect themselves against the lowering of their standard of life, which frequently results from the mass import of unorganized workingmen. The congress declares it to be their duty to prevent the import and export of strike breakers.

"The congress recognizes the difficulties which in many cases confront the workingmen of the countries of a more advanced stage of capitalist development through the mass immigration of unorganized workingmen accustomed to a lower standard of life and coming from countries of prevalently agricultural and domestic civilization, and also the dangers which confront them in certain forms of immigration.

"But the congress sees no proper solution of these difficulties in the exclusion of definite nations or races from immigration, a policy which is besides in conflict with the principles of proletarian solidarity.

"The congress, therefore, recommends the following measures:

"I.—For the Countries of Immigration—

"1. Prohibition of the export and import of such workingmen who have entered into a contract which deprives them of the liberty to dispose of their labor power and wages.

"2. Legislation shortening the work-day, fixing a minimum wage, regulating the sweating system and house industry and providing for strict supervision of sanitary and dwelling conditions.

"3. Abolition of all restrictions which exclude definite nationalities or races from the right to sojourn in the country and from the political and economic rights of the natives or make the acquisition of these rights more difficult for them. It also demands the greatest latitude in the laws of naturalization.

"4. For the trade unions of all

countries the following principles shall have universal application in connection with it:

"(a) Unrestricted admission of immigrated workingmen to the trade unions of all countries.

"(b) Facilitating the admission of members by means of fixing reasonable admission fees.

"(c) Free transfer from organizations of one country to those of the other upon the discharge of the membership obligations towards the former organization.

"(d) The making of international trade union agreements for the purpose of regulating these questions in a definite and proper manner and enabling the realization of these principles on an international scope.

"5. Support of trade unions of those countries from which the immigration is chiefly recruited.

"II.—For the Countries of Emigration—

"1. Active propaganda for trade unionism.

"2. Enlightenment of the workingman and the public at large on the true condition of labor in the countries of immigration.

"3. Concerted action on the part of the trade unions of all countries in all matters of labor immigration and emigration.

"In view of the fact that emigration of workingmen is often artificially stimulated by railway and steamship companies, land speculators and other swindling concerns, through false and lying promises to workingmen, the congress demands:

"Control of the steamship agencies and emigration bureaus and legal and administrative measures against them in order to prevent that emigration be abused in the interests of such capitalist concerns.

"III. Regulation of the system of transportation, especially on ships. Employment of inspectors with discretionary powers, who should be selected by the organized workingmen of the countries of emigration and immigration. Protection for the newly arrived immigrants, in order that they may not become the victims of capitalist exploiters.

"In view of the fact that the transport of emigrants can only be regulated on international basis, the congress directs the International Socialist bu-

reau to prepare suggestions for the regulation of this question, which shall deal with the conditions, arrangements and supplies of the ships, the air space to be allowed for each passenger as a minimum, and shall lay special stress that the individual emigrants contract for their passage directly with the transportation companies and without intervention of middlemen. These suggestions shall be communicated to the various Socialist parties for the purpose of legislative application and adaptation, as well as for the purpose of propaganda."

While this is the expression of the International Congress, it is important to bear in mind that, as declared by the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of America, the International congress has no power to determine tactics for national parties.

It is an advisory body only; its decisions are recommendations, not laws. Therefore, we in America, while paying due and just attention to the suggestions of the International congress, must determine our own position in the light of our experience.

Of all the nations of the world no other has an immigration problem of such vast magnitude as that with which the United States has to contend. For reasons inhering in its economic development, this nation has become the "melting pot" of the world.

Men and women of every race and tongue come to this country to the number of more than a million a year, inevitably creating conditions which greatly add to the complexity and difficulty of the struggle of the proletariat of the nation to emancipate itself from the oppression and thrall of capitalism. Diversities of race, creed, language and custom militate against the solidarity of the workers by obscuring in some degree the fundamental class struggle.

Of the workers who are drawn to the United States a large proportion come from countries where the standards of living are inferior to those which the workers of this country have, by long and arduous struggle, established.

Such immigrants, whenever they come in large numbers, for a time at least, until they are reached by the economic organizations of this country, commonly become, more or less unconsciously and unwillingly, tools of the capitalist class in their warfare

upon the organizations of the working class.

They accept conditions of labor, wages and standards of living lower than those generally prevailing. That this is a temporary phase of the immigration from practically every country is made clear by all the available statistics on the subject.

We must face the fact that the proletariat of the United States differs from the proletariat of every other country in that it is largely constituted of aliens of many races and nationalities, differing in race, language, creed and customs, who find it difficult to understand each other.

We have to-day great industrial centers, of which Gary may be cited as an example, almost wholly made up of foreign speaking workers, of many races, who have not been reached by the economic or political organizations of the working class of this country.

In "Free America" they are serfs, living and working under an industrial feudalism, little likely, unless special efforts are made to educate and organize them, to become American citizens, able to share effectively in the proletarian struggle as a whole or even to protect their own interests.

Enormous and varied are the difficulties attendant upon the political and economic organization of the working class under these conditions. But they are not insurmountable. They can and must be overcome.

The organized proletariat of this country must, through its political organization, the Socialist Party, and through the labor unions, make a supreme effort to break down the barriers which keep the immigrant workers outside of the organized working class movement.

This nation differs from every other in that a majority of its citizens are either naturalized immigrants from other countries or the children of such immigrants. It is the nation's task to break down the dividing lines of race, language, and custom and make intelligent citizens of all the varied elements drawn to its shores.

Even more is it the task and opportunity of the workers of the nation to overcome all those barriers which divide our class and so hinder its conquest of the economic resources of the nation.

Upon all essential principles we stand by and affirm the Stuttgart

resolution. But, while we agree with its declaration in so far that we see no proper solution of the difficulties arising from mass immigration "in the exclusion of definite nations or races from immigration," we cannot agree that such exclusion would, if determined upon, be "in conflict with the principle of proletarian solidarity."

We affirm, in opposition to this declaration, that the central, fundamental principle of Socialism is the class struggle; that it is the duty of the Socialist movement to fight the battle of the working class for a higher standard of living; and to protect, at all costs, the measure of civilization we have attained against any and all forces which menace it.

If ever the time comes when the protection of these requires the total exclusion of a race which menaces our standard of living, or our democratic institutions, then, in conformity with the central principle and mission of the Socialist movement, the Socialist Party would be compelled, however regretfully, to stand for that measure.

In view of the present existence of a grave and perplexing race problem in our southern states, the tragic result of the importation of slave labor by the capitalist class, it would be a betrayal of every principle and ideal of the Socialist movement should the Socialist Party, in such an emergency, act otherwise.

But that question is not immediately before us, nor do any available statistics warrant the belief that it is likely to be in the near future. The movement in favor of the exclusion of Asiatic immigration which has so long agitated many of the workers of our western states, is, we believe, due to a misunderstanding of the facts.

The volume of such immigration, including Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Hindoos and Malays, is at present too small to constitute a serious menace; nor are there any signs of a considerable immediate increase. It would, therefore, be unwise for the Socialist Party to advocate Asiatic exclusion at this time.

We call the attention of the workers to the fact that it is perfectly well understood that most of the Asiatic immigration of the present time represents, not the free migration of workers, but practically contract labor.

It is artificially stimulated, subsidized immigration against which the party,

in conformity with the Stuttgart resolution, stands with all labor organizations.

We direct the attention of our comrades and all members of our class to this condition, and to the fact that they can only secure protection from the menace of the mass immigration of contract laborers by controlling the political powers.

DEL. ATWOOD (S. D.): The farmers of South Dakota have sent their instructions on the immigration problem, that in case such a majority report was read as we have heard, to ask this amendment: "Recognizing that although capital is international and seeks its level as does water, we also favor the enactment of laws that will force capital to refrain from withdrawing from this country and investing in countries in which the excluded laborers reside." (Laughter.)

No second.

THE CHAIRMAN: The majority report of the committee has been read. A minority report has been read also. The only motion that the chair will receive, and no discussion will be permitted unless a motion is made, is a motion to substitute the minority for the majority report. Then both reports are before this body, and you can talk all you want to. I await a motion.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I move you that this congress concur in the majority report. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to adopt the majority report is in order, but an additional motion to substitute the minority report is necessary to get the matter before the house.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I move that. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The original motion is that the report of the majority of the Committee on Immigration be adopted. The amendment is that we substitute the minority for the majority report. The question is upon the motion. Delegate Untermann asks the floor as a member of the committee in order to elucidate the subject, he having made a long and special study.

COM. SPARGO: I rise to a point of information. The National Executive Committee, in drawing up the rules of procedure, which we adopted yesterday after amendment, decided that the reporters of committees should have thirty minutes after the discussion to sum it up, because it was specifically

understood by the committee, and I presume by the congress, that that was the whole of the time that the reporters of the committees were entitled to. I desire to know whether that is the ruling of the chair, and if so, then the reporter for the majority of the committee, the chairman of the majority, I suppose will close the discussion. Comrade Untermann understands his position. He is a member of the committee making the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will state as a member of the National Executive Committee, while I cannot just now find it in the rules, all there is in the rule, as printed, is, that the reporters and chairmen of committees shall have thirty minutes to close discussions, and the chair will follow the rules so far as they are stated. But I give Delegate Untermann the floor because I believe that the discussion in the first instance should be by those that have made a special study. You are entitled to fifteen minutes, Comrade Untermann, under the rule.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): Comrades, when I brought my report to this congress I was led to believe that the chairman of the committee, after the reading of the committees' reports through the secretaries, would have one hour to tell this congress the specific reasons of the individual members of that committee for the position which the majority took. Two years ago the National Convention appointed the immigration committee with instructions to study the question of immigration thoroughly, and especially the aspect and effect of Asiatic immigration on the working class of the United States. And now, having spent two years in this work, we have formulated the general conclusions resulting from the study of this material. The material is so voluminous and the question of such importance, that fifteen minutes is quite inadequate to deal with it.

I understand that many delegates have been sent to this congress, especially from the foreign-speaking organizations, with definite instructions to vote against any position which would involve the exclusion of Asiatic laborers. In other words, these men were instructed and the question was decided before the evidence had been placed before the congress. These men, instead of waiting until the material which this committee had

worked upon for two years was placed before this congress, and then being in an intelligent position to judge, had already made up their minds or were ready to have their minds made up.

A DELEGATE: That is not true.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates are out of order. The members on the floor should not interrupt the speaker. I call your attention, comrades and delegates, to the fact that you gain nothing by an interruption of the speaker. If he makes a mis-statement of fact you will get a chance to talk in reply.

DEL. UNTERMANN: The statement, that that is not true, may be answered by pointing out that I have letters here from the secretaries of certain organizations, informing me that certain delegates were instructed, and certain delegates have declared that they were informed that there were instructions. Therefore the whole case had been settled by these men before the evidence had been placed before them.

Now, I submit that a question so important as this, a question which, if decided in harmony with the majority, would mean that we should be compelled as the Socialist Party of America to dissent emphatically from certain portions of the Stuttgart emigration resolution, should be discussed at greater length and with greater earnestness than is possible in fifteen minutes. You do not know the amount of raw material that we have got. You have not the slightest idea of the material on which the majority report is based. How can you vote intelligently unless you have this material? Therefore, if the majority of the delegates are as much interested in this question as I am and consider it as serious as I think it is, then I hope that some one will make a motion that the order of business be suspended and that we shall be given an hour to state the question thoroughly. I think thirty minutes is too small for the question that is under debate.

DEL. CASSIDY (N. Y.): As this question is of vital importance to the Socialists of America and the Socialists of Europe, and as the committee have stated that they have voluminous evidence that should be submitted to us, and as one that is desiring enlightenment, I make a motion that the committee be given ample and sufficient time to explain to the inquiring dele-

gates here, those solicitous of information, so that we may act intelligently and vote intelligently upon this proposition. This is a subject of paramount importance to us.

After considerable discussion it was voted that both the majority and the

minority have one hour each in which to speak on their reports.

The hour of adjournment not having arrived, but it being necessary to sur- render the hall, the congress then, at 5 o'clock P. M., adjourned until Tues- day morning, May 17, at 9:30 A. M.

THIRD DAY'S SESSION.

Sec. Roewer called the congress to order at 9:30 A. M.

Del. Behrens, of Missouri, was elected chairman of the day.

Reading Clerk Strebel announced that the chairman of the Committee on Commission Form of Government would be glad to receive from the dele- gates at the congress any suggestions bearing upon this subject. The suggestions may be handed to the commit- tee at its meeting Tuesday immediately following the afternoon session, or the suggestions may be handed to the chairman of the committee, Comrade Jacobsen, or to the secretary, Carl D. Thompson, of Wisconsin, or to any member of the committee.

MINUTES.

On motion, the minutes of Sunday were approved as published, with the understanding that corrections as to the attendance of members might be handed to the secretary.

On motion, the minutes of Monday as printed were likewise approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business before the congress is the discussion on the reports of the Committee on Immigration. We have two reports, a majority and minority. The secretary advises me that the majority has decided to allow one of its mem- bers, Comrade Untermann, the entire time allotted to the majority, which is one hour.

DELEGATE UNTERMANN: Com- mune Chairman and Members of the Congress: The Socialist Party is pledged to realize a system of society in which every human being, regard- less of race or nationality, shall have equal industrial opportunities. But as a means to this end the Socialist Party is also pledged to raise the standard of living of the working class under the capitalist system and to assist and co-

operate with all labor organizations in their struggle against the encroach- ments of capitalism. The members of your committee yield to no comrade in uncompromising emphasis upon the fundamental principles of International Socialism. But the members of your committee are also emphatic in their declaration that revolutionary phrases without a revolutionary content do not make a revolution. To merely mouth revolutionary phrases and remain otherwise inactive or, if active, to assist such tendencies of the capitalist system as make for the weakness of labor organizations and for the weakness of the Socialist Party, would be not only Utopian but illogical and self-destructive.

One of the greatest difficulties in the understanding of the immigration problem is due to the great sectional differences in the development of capitalism in the United States. Com- rades who have seen only one state or one section of the United States do not know the capitalist system of the United States nor the Socialist Party of the United States. In order to fully understand this problem you must have been in the different sections of this country; you must have been in touch with the vital facts in those different sections, and you must have acquired a comprehensive grasp of the different forms which the evolution of capitalism takes in the United States.

That is one of the things which not only the European comrades, but many Eastern comrades have still to learn. We are not unmindful of the great service which the founders of scientific Socialism and its authoritative ex- ponents in Europe have rendered to the cause of Socialism. We have been sitting at their feet and learning. But we have learned the A-B-C of Socialism. We have learned to read by the help of that A-B-C and we have learned to read with understanding. And now the time has come to prove to the Socialists of the world that the Socialist Party of America can stand on its

own feet; that it has not only learned to grasp the principles of International Socialism, but also to apply them in a truly Marxian manner.

Therefore it will no longer do for us to merely repeat the statements handed down to us by way of Europe, but to apply them and apply them uncompromisingly, in such a manner that we will command the respect of the comrades of the International Socialist movement, in order to make them understand that we are fully able to deal with our own problems in the United States. (Applause.)

The maintenance of a normally sufficient standard of living in the United States is continually counterbalanced and counteracted not only by the general effects of our capitalist system as they are over the entire world, but the problem of immigration in the United States, as it is working out, has no parallel in any country of this world; for this reason we who are on the spot and in our own flesh and blood feel the effect of this system, are the ones who are called upon to solve it, and nobody else.

The army of the unemployed in the United States is continually increasing, not only by a voluntary immigration which comes to this country, not for the purpose of settling here, but merely for the sake of getting a job here, getting a little money and then going home again, but by specific immigration which is directed to a definite section of this country, which is aimed to make that section a sort of strategic basis from which that sort of immigration, having once gained a footing, can radiate into all other sections of this country, and that is the immigration of Asiatics, especially, as our report emphasizes, of Chinese, Japanese, Hindoos and Koreans.

While the immigration of this mass of men relieves the labor situation in the countries from which they come, it intensifies the difficulties of the education and organization of economic and political labor organizations in this country. They do not assist, but they hinder the economic and political development of the American working class.

The Socialist Party finds itself continually confronted by the fact that the realization of the ultimate ideals of our movement is obstructed and defeated by the very class for whom we are fighting this struggle. Whenever any

occasion shall arise in which the Socialist Party has to decide whether it wants to emphasise some ultimate ideal or whether it wants to take part in the present struggle and defend its own citizens, then the law of self-preservation will always enforce itself and the present needs of the situation will imperatively demand attention.

It has been said that the position of the committee is a violation of the principle of international solidarity. Look closely at that claim and you will find that it is a very specious one and really does not deserve attention. But because so many comrades attribute great weight to it, let me point out to you that the very men who are the originators of that claim have continually violated it themselves. I have only to refer to the attitude taken by the Socialists in Europe on other problems of their own in which there has come a conflict between ultimate ideals and present realities.

Don't you remember when Hervé of France demanded from the Stuttgart Congress that they should adopt an uncompromising declaration against any kind of war, that then he was quickly reminded by the German Socialists themselves that there were two kinds of war, a defensive war and an aggressive war, and that if at any time the Socialists of Germany should find themselves confronted by a war of aggression, they would take up arms and they would follow the call to arms of Emperor William and stand shoulder to shoulder with the aristocrats and capitalists against the working men of any other country attempting to invade their country? They did not think that was a violation of the principle of international solidarity.

Again, when the question of founding an international federation of labor unions came up, which has been pending for the last generation in the congresses of International Socialism, the German Socialists, who are dominant in the labor unions of Germany, refused to enter such an alliance so long as the foreign labor unions were dominated by syndicalists or the American labor unions by reactionary capitalist politicians. They did not think their refusal to join an international federation was a violation of the principle of international solidarity.

Again, when in Germany itself the question of immigration from Poland came up and the so-called "Sachsen-

gänger" were emigrating from Poland and Eastern Russia into Germany for the sake of getting jobs during harvest time, a great hue and cry went up from the German Socialists against that sort of emigration. They did not think that the insertion of a demand for the exclusion of the Sachsen-gänger was a violation of the principle of international solidarity.

But when it comes to Asiatic exclusion—oh, that is a horse of another color. It is supposed to be a violation of the principle of international solidarity. If we do the same that they did, if we refuse to be crowded out, if we refuse voluntarily to abdicate, if we refuse to give our places to outsiders and get off the earth, then that is a violation of the principle of international solidarity. Marx said, "Workingmen, unite," but he did not mean that they should all come to the United States. The principle of international solidarity may very well be maintained in another way. You know, I am a foreign born citizen myself, and I may look inconsistent upon this platform when I advocate exclusion. But, my friends, if I had been told at home that it is better for the revolutionary Socialist to stay at home and suffer than to come to the United States and make other people suffer, I would have stayed at home and worked for the revolutionary movement at home. But because I was told that the young men should go out in the world and find their fortune abroad, because I was told that there was plenty of room here in the United States, I came here, and then when I entered into the competition with my comrades here, I found out by long experience that living conditions in the United States were no better and the opportunities for further development no better than they were in Europe. If I thought I could do better in Europe I would go there. Now I am not going back to Europe, but I have become an American; I am a cosmopolitan; I have no home anywhere, no matter where, and I am going to stay in the United States and see if I can live here.

Now I shall not say anything about the minority report until Comrade Spargo has had the floor. But merely to anticipate the general attitude of the majority of the committee in that report, I will say that Comrade Spargo in principle perfectly agrees with us. He says exclusion is the only policy

that the American Socialist Party can consistently advocate. He accepts our position in theory, but repudiates it in practice. He says it is true that we should exclude them, but it is not necessary to exclude them now, because there is no danger. He stated specifically that in his opinion the time will come when the question of Japanese or Chinese exclusion shall be imminent.

I know that there is no immigration problem in the Green Mountains of Vermont, but there is a decided Chinese problem on the Pacific coast, and that is the reason why we are here talking and defending ourselves.

The minority report amounts to this: that we do not need to emphasize the principle of exclusion because the present contract labor laws are fully sufficient to keep out all essentially competitive elements of Asiatic origin. I deny emphatically that the contract labor clause is sufficient to protect American working people. (Voices: "Hear, hear," and applause.) The contract labor law itself is worded in such a fashion that its own wording defeats its own end. It does not keep out contract labor. There is no possible way by which any organization, whether it be capitalist or Socialist, could enforce the contract labor clause, because it is so inconsistent and is covered up in such a hidden manner that you cannot place your finger at any point and say that these are contract laborers. A contract labor agent may go to Europe and circularize the countries over there with inducements for immigrants to come over here. He can make contracts with them, written contracts, in which he agrees to pay their passage. He can pay their passage and can bring these men over here. He can take them across the country, and pilot them around to the places where they are supposed to break strikes or bring down the scale of wages, and at no time can you prove it on him and enforce the contract labor clause. And if you could get the facts you could not prevent him from distributing the laborers over the country after they came here.

But that is not the worst of it. The contract labor clause in reference to Chinese is worded like this: No Chinaman, who has been in this country and goes home and wishes to return, shall be permitted to return unless he has property worth one thousand dollars,

or debts to that amount. I need not tell you that no Chinese laborer can collect property worth one thousand dollars; but it is mighty easy for him to accumulate debts worth one thousand dollars. (Laughter.) All he has to do is to come to the contract labor agent and tell him he wants to go back to China and the contract labor agent can get an affidavit signed by an attorney, to the effect that he owes him one thousand dollars, all attorney's fees to come out of the laborer's wages, and he will come back to the United States after he has made his visit to China, and you cannot prove he is a contract laborer.

There is another thing in the Chinese exclusion law. In the first place, it does not include Koreans, Hindoos and Japanese. It says contract labor shall be excluded, but teachers, officials, travelers of all kinds, merchants and students shall be admitted.

Now, the contract labor agent has to do nothing else but give these men a certificate to the effect that they are merchants or students, and they can come in, and the contract labor agents in China bring in not only contract laborers, but also superintendents, in spite of the fact that there is plenty of labor here.

But there is still another thing. The great capitalist class of this country are the ones who are interested in having this immigration. They want it. Right here I saw this morning in the Chicago Examiner that the manufacturers are asking the right to import foreign workingmen. It would look very nice for the American Socialist Party if, from the floor of this congress, the reports went out that at the same time the manufacturers want to import foreign workmen, the Socialist Party says, "Yes, bring them in; we shall help you."

I do not attribute much value to this argument in itself, but taken in connection with all the facts you will find it is very significant.

As to the Chinese, the Department of Labor in California declares that the Chinese immigration which comes in by smuggling across the frontier of Mexico and across the frontier of British Columbia is either fully equal to that which comes through the custom house or exceeds it. So that there is no possibility of telling to-day how many Chinese and Japanese have come over the frontier. By the help

and with the collusion of the custom house officials in the pay of the great capitalists and under the direction of the capitalist politicians, these men that cannot get through the custom house are smuggled in over the frontier, and they have perfected the system to such a degree that they manage even to compel the American government to pay the passage of those who want to go back to China for a visit. They manage it in this way. There is a clause which says that every Chinese or any other Asiatic who is caught crossing the borders of Mexico shall be sent back to China or Japan at the expense of the government. Now, if a Chinaman wants to go home he tells the contract labor agent so. The contract labor agent smuggles him across the frontier and then he is caught coming back over the frontier, by the custom officials, and he is sent back to China—to visit at the expense of the American government.

Another clause provides that the Chinaman who has a wife and family may return to this country, and there is a regular system by which the same woman and child are used to play the part of family for many men.

The statistics reach away back to 1854, when the first anti-Chinese agitation began, and from 1854 to the present day they have been coming in either by smuggling or through the custom house through various ports. The largest number came in in the year 1884 and amounted to some 40,000 in one year. But in that year the exclusion law was passed, and while it is not enforced, there is difficulty enough yet in regard to Asiatic exclusion, and the labor organizations are fighting to secure the shutting off of immigration.

As long as only the quantity of immigration was registered in the census and in the statistics that had to come through the custom house, it looked as though Chinese and Japanese immigration had materially decreased. But that is not the fact.

Another thing. Practically 55 per cent of the entire Asiatic immigration comes to California, so that the state of California is practically the state in which this whole controversy rage. In the interest of the great manufacturing capitalists of this country the leading capitalist papers insist that the citizens of the state of California shall yield their right to live in favor of

Asiatic immigrants who shall be used to run down the wages of American workingmen, to increase the problem of unemployment, to reduce the standard of living and make it harder for us to organize economically and politically. That is the whole situation.

But, as a matter of fact, this immigration is not decreasing very much, and if you let the exclusion clause go there is no telling how many would come in. We need not wait for the future to realize the effect that such immigration, if unrestricted, would have upon the labor organizations of this country or upon the Socialist Party. We can see its effects upon the coast right now.

Do you think that the existence of the Labor Union Party upon the Pacific coast; do you think that the existence of a non-political I. W. W. upon the Pacific coast; do you think that the existence of the typical product of the Western states, the blanket stiff, has nothing to do with the Asiatic problem? I do not mean to say that it has everything to do with it, but the Asiatic immigration is one of the most essential factors in producing the large army of white unemployed in the United States who have no settled abode, who rove around without jobs; they have no settled abode; they lose the franchise, and losing that franchise they have no use for political action, and then they drift from the Socialist Party locals into the non-political movement, which emphasizes direct action and turns back into reactionary anarchism. (Applause.)

That is the direct effect produced and largely emphasized by Asiatic immigration. If you want to extend that same system over the United States; if you want to turn the vast majority of the working people of the West into blanket stiffs, then go ahead and admit the Chinese.

There exists the idea that China has developed so completely in efficiency that every square inch in China is occupied and that capitalism could not develop the resources of that country any more. And the same is also held of Japan. It is said that Japan is far ahead in the march of civilization, that it is a highly developed capitalist country, and that the population in both countries is so immense that they must necessarily have an outlet. Now, in the first place, that is not true; but if it were true, I do not see why their

necessities should compel us to injure our own organization at home and grant privileges that benefit foreign organizations while we would run down our own organization.

But the main argument itself is not true. There is no capitalism in China as yet which deserves that name. China is yet largely feudal. Its raw products have not been developed at all; they are just being developed. Only in a few of the largest cities are there any industrial plants. I have been in China and I have been in Japan. I have lived two years in the Philippines and worked with the Chinamen, and I do not want to work with them any more.

Those countries are not developed. There is no industrial proletariat that you can call by that name as yet. They have no labor organizations in the modern sense. Neither Japan nor China has developed a capitalism anything like the United States or Germany. It is in a state of development which at most resembles that of England 100 or 150 years ago, and even most of the peasants still live under the feudal system, and the old communes are just being disintegrated, so that an industrial proletariat is just in the process of formation.

That being the case, economic conditions in China and Japan and among the Hindus make these men not only economically backward but psychologically backward. These men still stand under the influence of Buddhism and Shintoism. They still believe in the ancient code of ethics and do not know anything about modern problems. They are just as lost when they come over to this country as you people would be lost if you were thrown en masse across to China or Japan. You would be in a new world. You would be among people that you would not understand, and you would be among people that would not understand you.

That being the case, the tendency would be for you to live an isolated life, to stay away from the actual industrial problems, to work them out for yourselves. And if that is the case, they may as well work them out for themselves in their own country instead of making it more difficult for us by coming over here.

The exports and imports of a capitalist country are certainly accepted by every economist as a very good indication of the stage of development of the

country. What are the exports and imports of China and Japan? Both amount to about the same figures. China, with an estimated population of 500 million, has a total export that amounts every year from 300 to 350 million dollars. Japan, with a population of 40 millions, has about the same.

In other words, the business of China, so far as shown by the imports and exports, amounts to about 80 cents per head of population. In Japan it amounts to about eight dollars. In the United States it amounts to about \$1,000. We export more than two billions of surplus every year.

That shows you how backward these countries are industrially. And if you have lived among the Chinese, if you have lived among the Japanese, you will know how positively difficult it is to make them understand even the first principles of modern labor organization, let alone of Socialism.

This is not a question of superiority of races. I am perfectly willing to grant that the Chinese and Japanese in their physiological qualities as a race are just as good and perhaps superior in some respects to us. That is not the question with us at all. The question with us is whether they as a nation, and occupying a certain geographical territory in a certain development and environment, are in a psychological stage which makes them accessible and assimilable to our ideas and civilization. I deny that emphatically on the strength of the experience of the comrades in the Pacific states.

So much for the export problem. Now, let me ask you to-day who is most interested in the importation of these men? I will waive the fact that the manufacturers ask again here the right to import workingmen. In itself that does not mean much, although it is very significant just at this moment. But I want to recall the statements made by the leading capitalists of this country, by Jim Hill, by Harriman, by the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor—mostly commerce—by the Chinese and Japanese statesmen who have been sent here during the last five years for the purpose of writing misleading articles in the leading magazines. Who are the real elements interested in that immigration? These elements are nobody else than the great capitalists of this country, who are vitally interested in

getting concessions from Asiatic capitalists just as the Asiatic capitalists in their present state of development are interested in getting concessions from American capitalists. The American capitalists have already realized that they are unable to compete against the Chinese industrially, and the only thing that they still have left is to send money over there to invest in Chinese enterprises, officered and operated by Chinese and Japanese.

About half a generation ago nearly all the leading experts in Chinese and Japanese industries were either Americans, Englishmen, Germans or some other European experts, drawn from the American and European universities. All of these men have practically been displaced to-day by Chinese and Japanese experts who received their education in Europe and America, so that nothing is left for the Americans. There is no danger that any American working population or European working population will ever emigrate in masses to China or Japan. The danger is wholly the other way.

The American capitalists need an outlet for their surplus goods. The Chinese capitalists need an outlet for their surplus population. They have got far too much population. They have not only enough population over there to act as strike breakers, etc., but they have a population over there that is continually at the point of hunger riots that threaten the whole foundation of society by violence; not simply by strikes, but by violence. And in order to get enough work for them they must get rid of that surplus, and they want to leave only those over there who are gradually developing into an industrial proletariat, and they can take care of them. We produce millions of surplus and send it over to China, for which the Chinese in return send us what? Strike breakers and contract laborers to run down our wages still more. (Applause.)

Having realized the danger of the development of capitalism in Asia, the American capitalists are now anxious to have the exclusion laws repealed. They are working tooth and nail to have the exclusion laws repealed and bring Chinese, Japanese, Hindoos and Koreans over here in masses. And in order to get that permission they are working now in the magazines and through their pulpits and the organs of

public opinion to enable them to bring in these masses.

One of the most significant statements in this respect made in recent times was that made by the Secretary of Labor—or rather Commerce—a few years ago, and repeated recently. He started out by saying that the American government, by its policy of exclusion, had seriously hurt the feelings of the Chinese and Japanese statesmen; that it was impossible now to get concessions from those people, and that while he did not advocate the repeal of the present exclusion laws, still the present exclusion laws were contrary to democratic institutions, and to the spirit of republicanism; that in the end it would become apparent to everyone that the development of a better citizenship in the United States depended upon the importation of more laborers, even from Asia; and that in time, while he did not advocate at present the repeal of the exclusion laws, he would feel compelled to advocate a policy in which restriction should be the exception and admission the rule. In other words, he wants them in, because every time a capitalist politician appeals to ideals and the spirit of republicanism, you can bet your life he has got a knife out for the working class. (Applause.)

And when it comes to that, when it comes to either standing with the great capitalist class in admitting such immigration, or standing with the small capitalists who happen to be in the same boat with us in this thing, I would rather stand against the great capitalist class, even if I am charged with violating the principle of international solidarity, than stand with it and admit men that run down our standard of living. We should be violating our duty to the working class of this country, if we sided with the great capitalists in this country. We should be destroying our own population, our organizations, and everything which we live for.

It has been argued that if we exclude the Japanese and Chinese, etc., and insist upon a strict enforcement of the laws now on the statutes, that then the American capitalists would take their capital and take it to China and manufacture goods there, and thus run down the standard of pay over here. Well, I say if this were a way to get rid of the capitalists, in heaven's name let them go. We do not need them

here. We can get along without them.

But the argument is a very specious one. You know very well that the capitalists of this country cannot take the farms of the United States to China. You know very well that the capitalists of this country cannot take the railroads of the United States to China; they cannot take their manufacturing plants or their raw material and work it into finished products in China. What they could eventually take to China would be a few industries like the manufacture of cotton goods, and such things, small matters. But, my friends, those industries will disappear anyhow, because in time China is going to develop its own cotton industry, its own sugar industry, etc., and bring you again in competition against Chinese labor, so that does not settle the problem at all.

Another point is, that such industries as the cotton goods industries are largely run by children and women, and if the exclusion of Chinese and Japanese means helping to abolish child labor, I think every revolutionary Socialist should be in favor of it. (Applause.)

The material on this subject is so voluminous that I cannot go over it all here. I hope you will have this published, so you can study it.

Just to show you how some comrades on the coast feel about it, here is a letter from the State Secretary of the Socialist Party in Washington, sent to one of the delegates here and given to me. Among other things this comrade says: "The sentiment among the workers, organized as well as unorganized"—he means on the Pacific coast—"is unequivocally for exclusion, and any expression based upon historical sentimentalism and theoretical impossibilism that will find a place in the national platform or in some of the other documents or that will be in the program of the international movement will militate against us on this coast."

He goes on to say that if we oppose exclusion, if we admit the Chinaman, we shall intensify the race problem here wherever it exists in the United States, and bring about conditions in which the race issue will be placed above the class issue, and then we shall be face to face with conditions where the Socialist Party cannot survive, because the Socialist Party itself will have advocated these conditions, and the capitalist defenders may well

charge us with an abandonment of the class struggle.

We have already the negro problem in the South, which was bequeathed to us by the ancient society of slavery before the civil war. Now, if we admit Chinese and Japanese and other Asiatics into the Pacific states to spread from there to the whole United States, we shall intensify that problem more and more.

And do not forget that these men are not citizens. They are not admitted to citizenship. Quite aside from the psychological difficulties of reaching them, there is the other potent fact that they cannot vote after we have got them organized. Either you must insist that the present exclusion laws shall be repealed, and then you must also insist that these men shall be admitted to citizenship with the privilege of voting, or you must insist that they be excluded. In order to render them essential elements of the proletarian revolution we must organize them and get them to use their voting franchise. Or we must defend ourselves and exclude them. That is our duty as Socialists, and no other.

It has been argued by some comrades that in this problem race does not go as deep as class. I do not know what they mean by such a phrase. But certainly this is not a question of a struggle between different classes, but of a struggle between the same class of different races. And when it comes to the question of whether we shall be permitted to live in our own house or whether we shall voluntarily abdicate and let somebody else come into our own house, I should think every sensible man would stand for his own house and for the right to live in it, rather than voluntarily emasculate himself and let somebody else in.

When the agitation against the Chinese began early in the '60's the sentiment in the Pacific states was very rabid, and one of the fiery orators of the Pacific coast in the House of Representatives got up one day and said: "I threaten nothing; but if you throw down the barriers and admit the Chinese into this country, I want to tell you that the army and navy of the United States is not big enough to protect those immigrants." That was oratory, but it stated at least one essential fact. While to us Socialists the race issue per se as a race issue is no fact that we need discuss, the race

feeling among the people of the United States to-day is a fact with which we must reckon if we would reach them with our Socialist propaganda. The anti-Chinese race feeling is so strong that we should be putting our own enemy into power if we placed ourselves in a position where they could exploit that race feeling against us.

To sum up, then. The immigration of Chinese and Japanese benefits wholly and exclusively the great capitalist class. They only are the ones who foster it and promote it, who circumvent the existing laws by every possible means. They are even now striving to repeal those laws, and if they succeed in repealing those laws, will be in a splendid position to weaken the labor organizations and the Socialist Party still more.

On the other side there is a small middle class and the great mass of the organized workingmen who oppose that immigration. Now, we know very well that the exclusion of Chinese merchants and middle class people will not prevent the disintegration of the American small capitalist class. The real enemy of the Socialist party is not the small capitalist, but the great capitalist.

The American small capitalist may flatter himself that by keeping out his Chinese competitor he can prolong the system of capitalism for himself still longer. But just the reverse is true. If you have a Chinese and Asiatic middle class in the Pacific states and all over the United States and lower the standard of living to which the American middle class is accustomed, then you take to that extent from the power of the great capitalist class to eliminate the middle class, and you will prolong the system of capitalism so much longer instead of bringing about its downfall. (Applause.) Therefore, I align myself with the small middle class in the Western states to the extent that I work with them when they work for exclusion. I am not going to yield a single principle of the International Socialist Party. I am not going to fuse with them. But if they are willing to help me in my agitation, I think we ought to be thankful to have the middle class help us, because, if the working class had been alone, there would be no exclusion law in the United States to-day. It is our duty, therefore, to insist emphatically upon the exclusion of these men at this time.

And if anyone says that the problem is not imminent at this time, then let him go out there and study the question on the ground from facts and not merely from books. (Applause.) The question is absolutely imminent in the United States on the Western slope. Vast masses of that section are already occupied by the Chinese and Japanese, and wherever they get control they shove out the white men, and when they have crowded us out they will reward us for our sentimental attitude by giving us the kick which we deserve.

The same with the negroes in the South. Wherever the negroes get control they stand aloof from the white men and will not work with them. In other words, there is a race feeling there that is so strong that the two races do not want to work together. They are not willing to work together, and while we stand for international solidarity and stand for rigid solidarity, we should be false to our Socialist agitation if we insisted first on doing away with the race prejudice. We should be defeating our own ends and turning our own weapons against us. And so long as that race feeling exists we must work first of all for the control of the essential requirements of Socialist society in this country. Let the Socialists of other countries teach their members that it is much better for them to stay at home and work at home than to come into the various countries and increase the difficulty of organization for other Socialists.

I realize very well that if this immigration is stopped the unemployment problem will be intensified in Europe and in Asia. But so far as Europe is concerned, I say that the Socialists of Europe are far better situated to grapple with the unemployed problem than the Socialists of the United States are. They have millions of voters; they have hundreds of thousands of party members; they have a fine organization; they have funds to burn; they have power through their representatives in the legislatures which we have not, to see that something is done for the unemployed. Therefore they are much better qualified over there to grapple with the intensification of the unemployed problem than we are in the United States to-day in our present undeveloped condition.

And do not forget that in Europe

to-day with the strength of the Socialist Party, every intensification of the unemployment problem means an intensification of the revolution, whereas in the United States every intensification of the unemployment problem means divided forces, means more of the conditions that work for the disruption of socialist and labor organizations.

As far as Asia is concerned, Asia has immense opportunities for developing an outlet. They need not come over here. Japan has Manchuria and Korea. China has vast districts which it can conquer. Let the Chinese capitalists develop Chinese society, just as the American capitalists have developed American society. Let them find room for their unemployed over there and employ them there and develop their own society. Let the Socialists of those countries organize their co-operative commonwealth themselves first, and then, when they have that organization, when they have their strong Socialist and labor organizations, then let them talk to us about international solidarity.

One more point. It is true that the race issue per se does not concern us. It is also true that, no matter what I might say about the development of this problem in the future, we certainly must take an attitude as modern Marxian Socialists which will keep us in close touch with the evolutionary tendencies in the present system. If any present policy in the matter of Asiatic exclusion goes contrary to the tendency of evolution, then the Socialist Party will find itself merely in a position where it will have to rescind its position on Asiatic exclusion.

On the other hand, if it takes a position which is in harmony with the evolutionary tendencies of to-day, then it will find that the position taken by this congress will be a help to us in our propaganda. Therefore, let each nation organize itself.

We have to emphasize every essential factor. The Jews are not a race in the sense in which we speak of races. That word as used by the Socialists means first of all a dominant and aggressive race. In the second place, it means a race occupying a national territory in which it resides. The Jews have physiological race characteristics, but no national territory. They have spread all over our civilization. They do not live apart, but they are in every land,

fully assimilable, with a splendid record of revolutionary history behind them, and we are glad to have them.

Do not deceive yourselves about the mixture of races. You cannot do away with the race problem by a mixture of all races; let that be clearly understood. I know that some of our good comrades think this thing will settle itself. Possibly like this: These fellows will come over here and will mix and gradually a mixed race will occupy this territory until all special race characteristics will disappear, and then there will be no more race issue. My friends, that is Utopian. According to the laws of evolution, which are well known to-day, every mixture produces two dominant race strains struggling with each other for survival. Blend the white race and the negro race, blend the white race and the Chinese, blend the white race and the Japanese, and you will find that one strain will gradually, in the course of generations, tend back toward the white, and the other tend back toward the black or the Japanese or the Chinese. It is ridiculous to expect to do away with the race problem in that manner, and the exceptions only prove the rule. The Aryan race will always occupy a certain geographical territory, and what the Asiatics will do in the coming years does not concern us at present.

Therefore, under present circumstances, we do not have to argue in favor of unrestricted immigration. The facts argue on our side in support of this resolution. The position of the Socialist Party should accord not only with the scientific tendencies of the times, with the evolutionary tendencies of the times, but also with the important demands of the working class in their struggle for emancipation from class rule. (Applause.)

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I move that we hear from the minority now.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded that the argument in favor of the minority report be made now.

COM. SPARGO: You have heard the majority and the minority report. According to the rules adopted for the discussion, the time is to be evenly divided. I can take the time for the minority report at any time that suits my convenience. I do not choose to occupy that time now, except under the ruling of the congress that I shall do so. I should prefer to wait until there

had seemed to me to be some substantial argument shown for the majority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that we hear the minority argument now.

DEL. DE BELL: I desire to say why I made that motion. Yesterday, when there was a motion that an hour be given for the majority report, it was well understood that that would be divided into three. There was another motion that the minority report have one hour which is centered all in one man, which I think is unfair. We heard the whole of the majority report and then we heard Spargo play to the galleries. I want the facts and not gallery speeches. We want to hear both sides on this subject.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): A point of order, that the rules of procedure decide what speeches are to be made.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): Comrade Untermann in speaking stated that he would reply to Comrade Spargo after he had finished. Does that mean that Untermann has thirty minutes at the close of this discussion?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): Comrade Spargo will have his speech and then I will reply.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the usual rule between the affirmative and the negative.

COM. SPARGO: There are two reports here. It is not an affirmative and a negative.

DEL. UNTERMANN: They may give you thirty minutes, too; I don't care.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I just want to remark that it is for this congress to decide whether there are any substantial arguments brought forth by Comrade Untermann or not; it is not for Comrade Spargo to decide. He has no right to say that he will wait until there is a substantial argument brought forth. That is not his business to decide; it is for this congress to decide. I am therefore in favor of this motion, so that if the comrade has substantial arguments he can show them and leave them to the congress.

DEL. GOEBEL: I have only to say relative to this, that I believe it is no more than fair that I should say to the delegates here assembled that I am with the minority report, but it is no more than fair that all of us delegates

here assembled should hear both sides primarily before the rest of us who are interested in this subject shall participate in the discussion. We have heard the side of the majority report. We have not yet heard the side of the minority report, except in an informal way yesterday. I think it is decidedly unfair on the side of Comrade Spargo to ask us to undertake to participate in the debate right now and give us no chance to see what there is on the other side, and leave him to do his talking at the close. We want some of the talk too. He has not all the points on his side either. He may be a good orator but that does not amount to anything. I say in all fairness we want to hear both sides, and both reports primarily, then discuss it, and then leave it to the reporter for the majority and for the minority to close the debate.

At this point delegate Strebler moved the previous question. Goebel asked a ruling as to whether Spargo would have an opportunity to sum up at the end of the debate. Del. De Bell raised the point of order that the previous question had been ordered. The chair sustained the point and put the motion that the speaker for the minority report present his argument at once. Motion carried.

Delegate Spargo asked for a definite ruling as to whether he would have a chance for rebuttal. Kennedy moved that thirty minutes be divided between Spargo and Untermann. Berger moved that each one be given thirty minutes. Carried.

At this point Delegate Rose asked for information about union restaurants and said he thought the unions should furnish the congress with a list of union places.

National Secretary Barnes explained that the officials of the Cooks' and Waiters' union had recommended King's Restaurant. Delegate Holm called attention to the fact that Thompson's and Henrici's were unfair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Spargo will now proceed.

COM. SPARGO: I shall try, in deference to the tender feelings of the comrade from Massachusetts, not to play to the gallery. I shall try to confine myself strictly to the point at issue between the majority of the committee and the minority now reporting.

We must all, I think, realize that the immigration problem presents itself to us here in America as it presents itself to the people of no other country in the world. We have taken a view of the Socialist movement, we have taken a tradition with a set of phrases and shibboleths and they have become part of our very existence. Both the majority and the minority recognize that it is quite impossible for the Socialist movement of this country to tie its hands and to say that for the sake of beautiful ideals and lofty sentiments it will never, at any time, consent to take action against a race or races as such. For my position on this question is not at all as stated by Comrade Untermann. I prefer to state my own position, and you can gather it better, I think, from the printed copies of the minority report than you can from Comrade Untermann's interpretation. It is not at all true or just to say that my position is that I believe the exclusion of the Asiatic to be necessary but not convenient. On the contrary, my position is that, if ever the time comes when I believe Asiatic exclusion to be necessary, then I shall believe it to be justified.

But I do not now believe Asiatic exclusion to be necessary. That is, I take a very different position from that stated by my friend and comrade, Untermann.

Let me at the very beginning then, with that position clearly before you, refer to some of the statements and arguments and theories advanced by Comrade Untermann in his defense of the position of the majority. And since he began by quoting from the news of the day, I too may begin by quoting from the news of the day, from page 10 of the same paper from which he quoted at page 12. There I find that five regiments of American militiamen are sent into Hannibal, Missouri, to defend what? American scabs against foreign strikers! (Applause.) I suggest to you that the same manufacturers who are urging the free importation of foreign laborers may, if that kind of thing continues, arrive at a position where they will say that they prefer to have the docile American working man rather than the revolutionary immigrant. In point of fact, that is the position that is being arrived at, and by no inconsiderable body of employers of labor in this country. When the McKeesport strike

occurred and they felt somewhat of the temper of these alien workers with whom they had to deal, it was very evident to any one who took the slightest trouble to sense the feeling of the middle class, the employing class, in that great center that they were beginning to feel that they wanted to get the foreigner out rather than to get him in, and anybody today, who knows our great eastern industrial centers, must know that there is coming over the minds of the capitalist class of America a consciousness that the revolutionary temper is by no means the exclusive proprietary possession of those whose forefathers came over and landed at Plymouth Rock, but that there is good fighting material among our alien proletariat. (Great applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair desires to announce to visitors that there is a ruling of this congress, not only of this but of preceding national conventions, to prohibit expressions from the visitors either of approval or of disapproval. The chair therefore desires the visitors not to give expression hereafter to their feelings on the matters before the house.

COM. SPARGO: We were told that no man can understand American capitalism and no one can know anything of its real nature if their view is dominated and formed by the conditions prevailing in a single section of the country. And yet, when it comes to the discussion of this question, we are asked as a national party acting on behalf of a national movement to take an entirely sectional view of the problem. It is true that in this country there are five or six states in which the workers feel the competition and possible menace of oriental labor, but for the rest of the states that problem does not exist. It is a question of the interests of a small section of the country, comparatively, against the rest. If you say that there are six states of this country that feel the effect of the competition of Asiatic labor, then I will say that you must bear in mind that there are thirty-six states which do not. It is entirely a sectional view of the labor question which is presented to us here. Mark you, I do not say that if a real menace to the working class of this country exists in a single state or in a single village, that we should not take action upon it, but I submit that it comes with rather

ill grace and with the warrant of a small body of fact at any rate that Comrade Untermann, when addressing us in support of the majority report, should seem to taunt us with the fact that we had no right to decide upon the question unless we knew something of the conditions generally prevailing in the country. Now we are told that, due to the mass of Asiatic immigration into a certain section of the country, we have a non-political Industrial Workers of the World organization; that Asiatic labor is one of the causes—the most important cause—of this tendency away from political action, and in the direction of reaction and anarchism; and yet, Comrade Untermann, the Industrial Workers of the World was not born in the west. It was born in the middle west, right in this city of Chicago, where there is relatively no Asiatic labor at all. And the one battle of that same movement in this country has found its field not in the west with your Asiatic labor, but in the east against your alien European labor. And I call Comrade Untermann's attention to the fact that if you take any number of the trades, the more important groups in our labor organizations, you will find this thing to be true in this country. Take for example the building trades. In spite of the fact that you have Asiatic immigration into the west, in spite of the fact that you have the cheap labor of the western slope, the fact remains that the wages are higher on that Pacific slope than they are in other sections of the country where you have not got that cheap labor at all.

You come to us to-day and you ask us to take this action against Asiatic labor upon this ground: the ground that the Asiatic worker, when he comes in, begins to tear down the standard of living; and that his competition by his working for low wages is a serious menace to the workers of this country. You tell us it is not because of his race that you want to exclude the Jap, but simply because he is an economic competitor who lowers the standard of living, working for lower wages and making the immediate struggle of the working classes harder. And I reply to you that I perfectly acquiesce in the principle that, if ever the time comes when there is such a serious menace to the worker's standard of living, at that time, no matter how regrettably

we should have to say: "We must protect that which we have." I should be sorry to see our old international watchword go by the board; I should be sorry to see the international spirit taken out of our movement, and crossed or embittered at any point by any kind of race line, or any suggestion of race prejudice, but if the worst came to the worst I should be in the position of one of two men on a raft adrift at sea. Comrades, as long as there was enough for both it was all right, but when it came to the last drink or the last crust, then both would fight like dogs for that last drink and that last crust. What you ask us to do if we have to do it, is an evil thing, and can only be justified as the lesser of two evils. Now, if you want to exclude the Jap because he lowers the standard of living or if you want to exclude him because he works for lower wages, why, I ask you, pick out the Jap? Those phenomena are not peculiar to the Jap. They are true of the Englishman when he comes first. It was true of the Irishman when he came in large numbers. It was true of the German; and it is true to-day of the Russian Jew. It is true to-day of the immigrant from Southern Europe. It is true to-day of the Italian. It is true of the Greek. The immigration of these men is one of our big problems in the east. But I say to you that you cannot take that position. You cannot exclude the Japanese to-day on the economic ground and be just and fair. I say to this congress—there is a small number of Japanese workers coming into this country, the number is relatively insignificant. No evidence, that anybody has been able to gather, warrants the suggestion that the Jap lowers the standard of living any more than the Englishman did when he came, the Irishman, the German, the Jew or the Italian. Now this is what I found, I found there was a consensus of opinion that the Jap, when he came to the Pacific slope, was like the Jew when he comes to the Ghettos of our eastern cities. And by the way I do not think I can congratulate that majority for its frankness in that report. There are certain compliments handed out to the Jew to placate him, to satisfy him for the moment, that won't fit the facts in the case. The Ghetto represents quite as bad a social condition as any Jap or any other Asiatic laborer is likely to produce. Now, what did I find? I found there is a consensus of opinion that the Jap temporarily lowered wages, and I know—not as a matter of theory at all, Comrade Untermann, but as a matter of pretty practical knowledge—that that is what immigrants coming into a country generally do. I worked in the city of New York for far lower than the prevailing wages. I worked in the city of New York for seven dollars and fifty cents a week. Why? Because I stood in the bread line. Because I stood in line waiting for a job to sweep the snow from the streets of the city of New York. And if I was willing to sweep that snow I was willing to take whatever I could get in order to plant my feet firmly on American soil. I say to you that is true of the great bulk of our mass immigration. We have to face this fact; America is not a race. America is a nation made up of an amalgamation of all the nations of the world, and just as in our civic life we have got to take all these nationalities and blend them into a common citizenship of as high a type as we can attain, so we must blend together all the varied elements that come to our shores, and not until we have exhausted every other means open to us, shall we be justified in saying to any race: "You cannot come inside." And I say to you that we have not yet exhausted every means open to us. Our great labor organizations have largely neglected the foreign immigrants, and especially the Asiatic immigrant. Our own party has largely neglected the foreign immigrant, and made no efficient efforts to get him into the ranks of the organized proletariat of this country. What do I find? I find that Jap, like most other people, as soon as he gets a start, and gets his grip on the life of the nation, then he is ready to organize, ready to fight to protect his interests. Then he is ready to make demands. You cannot frighten me by telling me that some Japs were brought in to break a strike somewhere, where European laborers were on strike. I know that is true; but for every instance of that kind that you bring I shall bring another instance of European or American workers going in to take the place of Japs and Chinamen on strike. You need not go far from where we stand to see the Jap as he is when he has got his chance. Go over to Di-

vision and Ashland, I think it is, and there you will find them building a new Y. M. C. A. building. You will find there the Jap working with the Italian, working with the Slav, working with the German, working with the Irishman, and he has his union card, and he is proud of his union card, and is drawing his \$3.20 a day. You say he will be a menace because he has not got a vote. You would keep him out because he cannot get a vote. Will you also keep out women who have no votes in the majority of the states? Will you also shut out the poor whites who are literally disfranchised in a large section of this country? Will you not rather say that if the Jap comes to America and becomes part of its industrial life, takes an efficient part in its struggle, then because he is a worker contributing to the great stream of its well being, then that Jap should have a vote just the same as the Jew, the Italian and every other worker? That is the position, it seems to me, for the Socialist Party at this stage of the game to take.

I do not think there is the slightest reason to believe that the difficulty of reaching the Jap and bringing him into our industrial movement and our political struggle will be any greater, if as great as the difficulties we confront in many other instances. I have the authority of our Comrade Haywood for saying that in his experience as an official of the Western Federation of Miners he has found this to be true; temporarily they may be a strong competitive factor, but after a little while the Jap makes good fighting trades union material. And what is Comrade Haywood's experience in his organization is the experience, I think, of most men who have had practical knowledge of the subject, Comrade Untermaier.

I took the trouble some time after I had been elected to this committee and had gathered together a great volume of statistical data—I took the trouble to see what I could make out of that data, to give it the form of a graphic chart. I took the map of the United States of America, and on that map I painted over certain localities colors to represent certain kinds of industries, where certain kinds of labor were employed. And then I began an investigation on my own account to find out just what the actual experience of the labor organizations of those various

callings had been, and this is what I found: I found that in the East, beginning in the anthracite regions and following the coal miner all along his trail, this was the cry: "Every other worker we can assimilate, but we can not assimilate the Sicilian. We ought to be protected against the Sicilian. The Sicilian ought to be excluded." That was the coal miners' cry. He cared not at all for the Jap. Then I went to the cigar makers and I said, "What is your experience?" and they said: "In the early eighties our fear was the Chinaman; and we sent train loads of men across this continent with the cry, 'The Chinese must go.' We instructed our men to boycott the Chinese laundries, Chinese restaurants, Chinese servants of all kinds. We fought the Chinamen and their exclusion took place. And not until then did we begin to try to organize the Chinamen. And then we found that the Chinamen were easily organized, were good fighters, and maintained high wages. But as soon as the Chinamen were out of the way we were frightened by the Jap peril. The Japs went into the cigar business and began to cut our prices. Now, we said, we have the yellow peril once more. But soon the Japanese did not cut our prices any more. You cannot buy a cheap Japanese made cigar in any of the eastern states. But you can find in San Francisco a cheap cigar, made by cheap European labor. So," said the cigar maker, "we soon found that the Japs did not really menace our organization. But the Belgians came along. We cannot assimilate the Belgian; we cannot fight the Belgian; the Belgian is the enemy of the cigar makers' union to-day." And every official will tell you that they fear the Belgians and not the Jap, and I tell you the same thing is true going down the lines of all the trades. I spoke to one man prominent in the Garment Makers' union. I asked him: "What is the situation in your trade? Why is it that the organization in Rochester has gone down? Why have you the trouble in Cleveland? Why isn't your union holding its own?" They said, "Our trouble is with the Russian Jew, and with the Italian, and they make it impossible for us to carry on our organization." And what was the meaning of all this? It simply means that when I got my chart completed and looked it over, I found that everywhere there

were local conditions that seemed to justify an expression of hostility against a race or races as such and I say to you here in all sincerity: You must face this fact, that, if in response to the request of the workers of the Pacific slope you agree here to-day to exclude the Jap, to-morrow in response to an equally strong demand from the miners in the East, and from the garment makers and the cigar makers you will have to exclude the Sicilian, you will have to exclude the Russian Jew, and will have to exclude the Italian.

There is no middle way at this hour. If you are frank, members of the majority of this committee, if you are frank in making your report, then the shoe is on the wrong foot. If you propose to exclude a race because of its economic competition with the workers already here, don't begin with the least significant, or with the least important. Don't begin with that race which, less than any other, is given to pulling down the standard of living; begin with those that are more important; and that you won't do. Instead of that you throw bouquets at them and tell them what splendid revolutionary material they make.

Comrades, I should be the last man, I think, to try to ignore the experience of our comrades of the west. I have seen the Jap in the west. I have seen him work. I have felt something of his meaning there as an industrial and socialistic phenomenon. But I cannot blind my eyes to the fact that if today you vote Asiatic exclusion, next time you will be voting Italian exclusion, or Hebrew exclusion, or some other kind of exclusion, and I cannot blind myself to the fact that this is a relatively—relatively, I say—small and insignificant part of our present immigration problem. Our present immigration problem is by no means a problem of specially dangerous competition from any race or races as such. Our immigration problem lies in this very surely: Our proletariat in America, as I state in my report, is becoming a foreign and an alien proletariat. You have in Pittsburg a very graphic illustration of what I mean. There are men, not brought from Japan, not from China, but from southern Europe mainly accepting a low standard, never reached by any organization of the workers, either economic or political, in any degree at all. They too are

aliens. They too are without votes. They too will constitute a peril. And if you want to know what I think to be the most important aspect of the immigration problem at this hour, it is for the organized workers of America in the Socialist Party and in their trades unions to go out and say to these workers: we must break down this barrier, and you must become part of our organization. You must become part of this great world struggle.

Go down to Gary, Indiana; and while you are talking about the menace to our civilization from the Asiatic, there is a menace, a real menace at the very doors of this great city. They are not a menace because they are Croatians, they are not a menace because they are Roumanians, they are not a menace because they belong to any particular nationality: they are a menace because the organized workers of this country fail to do their duty, fail to recognize the situation.

Comrades, there is an immigration problem; but it is not insurmountable. If the time comes when we, after serious, honest, conscientious and prolonged effort, have to say, we have failed and we cannot do it, and in protection of ourselves we must close the doors to the Asiatic, I shall be ready to close the doors. If it comes to the time when we must close the door to the Italian, I shall be ready to close the door. If the time comes when we have got to close the door against men of my own race, I shall say: We must close the door. But that time is not yet. You must remember this. You see the Jap coming from the university of Tokio, going into the factory and the mine in America, taking a position as a boy to sweep the floors. You see him there subsidized by the imperial government of Japan, and you do not always realize that it is not the Japanese boy that you are seeing, but a potential Japanese captain of industry. Well, you say, because of that we must exclude him. We must not let him come here to get his training, to become a captain of industry to-morrow. Suppose you exclude him; what will the Japanese government do? It will say to the Japanese boys: "Come home; we can get plenty of brilliant young college graduates to come here and teach us right at our own doors." Do you think you can escape this ultimate problem by any act of legerdemain in the way of exclusion? I say to you

that while you are asking for the exclusion of the Asiatic man, the British worker is asking for the exclusion of the Asiatic product. In the campaign against Hyndman, what was the concrete picture presented? A Jap working for twenty-five cents a day, and the cry: "If you elect Hyndman, cheap Japanese products are going to kill you off." Then what are you going to do next? I suppose the majority will seriously propose the endorsement of the Republican platform for high tariff.

It appears to me that at this moment with this issue before us the Socialist party can do but one thing: It cannot justify itself upon any economic or social ground in excluding the Jap. It may justify itself on the score of race, because of the Jap's color or the slant of his eyes. But if they wish to act upon that ground they should be frank enough to say so. It may be that at some time—distant or perhaps nearer than some of us think—there will be a great struggle between the white and the yellow race, and I tell you frankly that my class consciousness surmounts my race consciousness after all, and if the Jap will carry the highest standard of civilization, if he will carry the Socialist banner where the white man fails, all hail the Jap; let him carry it for me.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I desire to offer a brief substitute for the majority and minority reports before us. I will read it:

"The Socialist Party of the United States favors all legislative measures tending to prevent the immigration of strike-breakers and contract laborers, and the mass importation of workers from foreign countries, brought about by the employing classes for the purpose of weakening the organization of American labor, and of lowering the standard of life of American workers.

"The party is opposed to the exclusion of any immigrants on account of their race or nationality, and demands that the United States be at all times maintained as a free asylum for all men and women persecuted by the governments of their countries on account of their politics, religion or race."

If this substitute is seconded I will say a few words.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): I second it.

DEL. HILLQUIT: The reason for this substitute is not because I want to offer a substitute, but because the

majority and minority reports are, I think, very unsatisfactory, both in form and in substance.

Now, comrades, don't misunderstand me. I wish to say in absolute sincerity that I consider Comrade Untermann's statement a masterpiece of reporting, such as our Socialist conventions should have more of in the future, a dignified, scholarly statement without empty phrasing, and one of the very first attempts made by the Socialists of this country to face a problem and to solve it in a proper and dispassionate manner. On the other hand, I consider Comrade Spargo's speech as a masterpiece of oratory. The only objection is that my friend John did not, in this case, make his text fit his resolution. The speech, beautiful as it is, does not harmonize with the conclusion.

Now I think we ought to take a definite stand one way or the other. We ought to state it briefly and concisely. Suppose we adopt the majority resolution and you boys are cornered on the street by a trade union man or somebody else and they ask you: How does your party stand on the subject of immigration? you will say: Well, the party aims at this and that, and while it believes in the International Socialist position as contained in the Stuttgart resolution in this and that, and if you proceed with the argument to any degree you have to read the entire resolution in order to give expression to our sentiments or views. The same thing applies exactly to the minority report; that is, so far as form is concerned. Now so far as substance is concerned don't forget one thing. We are not now working for the enactment of practical measures. The question does not come before us as it would come if we were in Congress and a bill were pending before us. The question of practical application is for us today a minor consideration. What is primarily before us today is the principle involved; and on the question of that principle the majority and the minority agree, practically in words as well as in sense. I will read it to you: The majority say: "We may well concede the right of the International Congress to declare that it sees no proper solution to these difficulties in the exclusion of definite races and nations from immigration, and nevertheless deny that an opposite policy is necessarily in conflict with the principles of proletarian

solidarity." That is the majority report. Now take the minority report: Comrade Spargo takes the same position. "We will agree with this declaration (that of the International Congress) in so far that we see no proper solution of the difficulties arising from mass immigration in the exclusion of definite nations or races from immigration. We cannot agree that such exclusion if determined upon would be in conflict with the principle of proletarian solidarity."

Those are almost word for word alike. And further we read: "If ever the time comes when the protection of the workers requires the total exclusion of a race which menaces our standard of living or our democratic institutions, then in conformity with the central principle and mission of the Socialist movement the Socialist Party would be compelled, however reluctantly, to stand for that measure."

In other words in both cases we justify the principle of the exclusion of a race or races as such. To that I am opposed.

I fully realize that this is an exceedingly intricate problem that we are facing now. I know it will not be solved by phrases. I know it will hardly be solved at all. It will probably come before us in concrete form again and again. But the question before us is not to find an absolute solution. There is none. But it is a question of formulating the nearest possible solution. There is a certain conflict involved in it. We are the party of labor. We are also the party of Socialism. If the interest of the working class should clash with those of the international proletariat, which of those interests should we sacrifice to the other? That is about our problem as it presents itself to us.

Now, I claim that this conflict of interests is more imaginary than real, that in the long run the interest of the American proletariat is identical with the interest of the working class of the world. That is the idea upon which our entire philosophy and programme are based. But when we have said: "We must support all movements of the workers for their interests," we have not said all. We must support all enlightened movements of the working class conducive to their true and ultimate interests. For instance, we will not support the policy of some trade unions, conservative trades

unions, in closing their doors. Now they have full and practical justification, from the point of view of their immediate interests, to do so. The workers of that particular trade surely benefit for the time at least by such a policy. But we are opposed to it. Why? Because it is an exotic benefit, which in the long run will react against that particular trade, and against the working class at large. If restriction of immigration is an analogous thing we are opposed to it. On the other hand we fully approve of all efforts of the working class, of the organized workers, to keep away the scab no matter in what form he appears, either as a strike breaker born and raised right here, as a strike breaker coming voluntarily from another country, or as a strike breaker imported from another country by the capitalist class. It is a war measure. We recognize the necessity of such measures. We have always approved of the protection of the working class in such conflicts against such action on the part of scabs or on the part of the enemies of labor organizations.

Now when this question came before the Stuttgart Congress the comrades coming from all parts of the world, with the exception of part of the American delegation and I believe also the Australian delegation, took this position: They said, "Here is the line of cleavage—for economic reasons, for reasons of self-protection the working class may well object to the immigration of certain elements calculated to destroy their organizations and lower the standard of life, but not on account of race or color or creed. We as Socialists should have in mind the interests not of any one nationality but of all the workers of the world, and can under no circumstances support such exclusion." It seems to me that is the only proper position to be taken by the Socialist Party. You talk about future race conflicts between the white race and the yellow race. Why should we indulge in such flights of imagination? Why should we pass resolutions based upon such dreams? Dreams that are worthy of the pen of Jules Verne or other fiction writers. There is no such conflict before us. We are not called upon to pass upon such a conflict. Why fight with ghosts? You speak of the Chinese with different habits, and different customs and different religions and different concep-

tions of life. That has absolutely no bearing on this question.

Within a very few months an International Socialist Congress will be held. We are about to elect delegates to that Congress. Our representatives will go there as the representatives of the Socialist working class of the United States. There we shall meet the representatives of the workers of other nations, of all the nations of Europe, and representatives of the Chinese and the Jap Socialists and workers. We shall come together and our very first statement to the entire world will be: "We are here gathered together from every corner of the globe as one army of brothers." Shall that statement be a lie? I am not going to carry you away with phrases of international brotherhood, but we certainly consider that statement a little more than a mere phrase, don't we? When we say that we are a part of one great international brotherhood of the working class we mean something by it. Just what do we mean? We mean this: That the capitalist mode of production has the tendency to level the entire world and mold it into one form; that it has a tendency to appropriate every part of the globe; that China may soon become a capitalist country; that Japan is becoming a capitalist country, that these things are a question of time only. We mean by that the problems that confront the Socialists and the workers of today are international problems, not national problems. We mean by that that our fight to be successful must be made on international lines, and not otherwise.

I do not know, comrades, whether the working class and the Socialists of America may not have occasion within a year, or two or three, to appeal to the workers of the entire world and perhaps to the Chinese and Japanese workers for aid and assistance in some particular struggle which they will be waging against the capitalist class of this country. Now the Stuttgart resolution does not advocate absolutely the free immigration of labor. It makes a distinction. It makes a very important distinction. It discriminates against the strike breaker, and it discriminates against mass importation of labor from any country stimulated by the capitalist class for the purpose of lowering the standard of life of the native laborer. I say to you now that I do not

know whether this Asiatic immigration is free or imported. I am under the impression that it is largely stimulated and artificial. I am under the impression that it is created and maintained by the employing classes; and if it is,—and our Western comrades are better authorities on that than I—if it is, then we may in full accord with the spirit and letter of the Stuttgart resolution countenance their exclusion, not because they are Chinese, not because they are Japanese, but because they are being imported by the capitalist class to break the organizations of the working class, and the workers in merely following the instinct of self-preservation are bound to resist.

That is absolutely in consonance with the International Stuttgart resolution; it has absolutely no reference to a race as a race; it has reference to conditions which may or may not exist and which may change in a year. It leaves our principles absolutely inviolable, and the brief substitute which I submit to you aims only to make this distinction; the distinction between the right of the working class to fight for its own existence, and in such fight to resist the importation of foreign labor stimulated or caused by the employing class for the purpose of weakening or destroying the organizations of American labor or lowering their standard of life, and on the other hand the exclusion upon racial, national or religious grounds. This substitute I believe practically presents the position of progressive trades unionism, just as it covers the position of all international Socialists.

DEL. MORGAN (III.): I desire to ask the comrade whether he pressed his substitute upon either the majority or the minority or has it been formulated since we adjourned last night?

DEL. HILLQUIT: It has been formulated, if that is of any interest, within the past half hour.

DEL. MORGAN: I thought so.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Does it bear the marks of hasty preparation?

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): May we ask Comrade Hillquit to read his resolution again?

The resolution offered by Delegate Hillquit was then read by the Secretary.

COM. SPARGO: A parliamentary inquiry. I desire to know whether upon consideration of the substitute the minority should be willing to ac-

cept it, will it be within the power of the minority so to do? Or will the consent of the Congress have to be obtained?

THE CHAIRMAN: It occurs to me that the reports of both the majority and the minority are now in the possession of the Congress.

DEL. HILLQUIT: There might be unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there should be unanimous consent it would be just the same as voting to adopt the substitute.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (III.): It seems to me that there must have been a strange force working in this congress that we should have presented a substitute for both the majority and minority reports. It seems to me that it would be a better illustration of American solidarity if we came out straight for the declaration of the international programme laid down last year. I do not see why we should waste time over this immigration problem. This immigration problem has only been stirred up in this congress by the capitalist class itself. The Socialist Party as such has absolutely nothing to do with this question. This question of immigration is as old as the hills. So long as capitalism changes its production from one country to another, from one century to another, or from one village to another, we are going to have immigration. But why should we bother ourselves with this? Let me read you a bill before our capitalist Congress at the present time, and I want the majority to listen very carefully for they will find themselves about a year behind the times.

In the House of Representatives on February 22, 1910—I think that was somebody's birthday—the following bill was introduced which was referred to the committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and ordered printed; and since that time, I believe yesterday, another bill even more stringent was introduced in the lower house of Congress. Let me read this: "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, that Section 2 of the Act entitled An Act to Regulate Immigration of Aliens into the United States, Approved Feb. 20, 1907, be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Section 2. That the following classes of aliens be excluded from admission

to the United States: All idiots, imbeciles, feeble minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, and persons who have been insane within five years previous, persons who have had two or more attacks of insanity, paupers, persons likely to become a public charge, professional beggars, and persons economically undesirable." Do you understand that? "Persons economically undesirable." Where does the majority report come in? It goes on: "Male persons over sixteen years of age who do not possess in their own right at least 100 dollars of lawful American money, or some other money which can be made into American money."

I could go on and read this bill and you would have a better proposition than the majority report offered to this congress.

I say to you that the capitalist class of America is absolutely class conscious, and if we were willing to adopt the majority report we would be a lot of monkeys and we ought to be transported back where we came from.

This Congress ought to express positively its solidarity with the Japanese, or any other race that might be born over night. Let them get into the field of the Socialist movement; and let us give expression to that idea in this Socialist Congress.

The city of Gary has been referred to—the ready made city—you can buy ready made cities as you buy a ready made suit of clothes—there is Gary with a population of 30,000, built practically over night, one of the biggest industrial centers of the United States. And while this is going on in Gary, Indiana, the steel trust is operating its mills in European countries, and building mills in Asiatic countries, and at this particular time, comrades, the United States steel trust is preparing balance sheets to see which of their mills in Europe, or in Asia produce steel rails cheaper than can the mills of Bethlehem, or of Gary, or of Sharon or of Pittsburg. You can rest assured that the moment the output of the mills in America costs too much they will run overtime in China or Japan or wherever they may have their plants. I want to ask you then, where the question of raising or lowering the standard of living plays any role in this proposition whatsoever.

Take the Diamond Match Trust. It has plants everywhere except in Rus-

sia; the government there wants that easy money for itself. It was organized in 1887. Since that time with fifty per cent less people they are producing ten times as much stuff for the market, and in every country they are producing the same thing. If they cannot sell the American product in Sweden they will sell the product manufactured by them in Sweden. And you cannot overcome that proposition because of the very nature of capitalism which is always international.

I had a great fear, and I raised that question here in Chicago, that this Congress would go on record as favoring the exclusion of the races that have been mentioned, and it would be the first proposition on which the Socialist Party of the United States would go to pieces or degenerate into an anarchistic organization. The Socialist Party of the United States ought to take the lead in saying that America is the battle ground of all the nations of the world against capitalism. There is no other country that is as cosmopolitan as America. And if we are not willing to go on record as favoring this international proposition we have no right to be called an international party; we do not belong to it; we belong to the State Socialists. We should lose not only our international solidarity; we should lose our revolutionary spirit; and the Socialist Party of the United States if it needs anything today needs revolutionary spirit. It is the easiest thing in the world to talk nice, polished language, but when you get down to the rank and file of the working class of America it is a different thing. If the Socialist Party is going to go on record on a proposition that in the first place has no place in this Congress, if we are to go on record as being in favor of the exclusion of

any particular races, I say that the Socialist Party from that time on is no more the place for me, is no more the place for a Socialist of the world. I came to this congress for other purposes. I am not going to plead with the delegates. If the delegates who are sent here are of the same opinion as the majority report, I am afraid I have no place to sit with them, and to deliberate with them on a proposition of this kind, for I want a proletariat of the world, a proletariat true to its name, and true to its traditions. Once we have settled this proposition the Socialist movement of America will go forward as it has never gone forward before. We are going backward because we don't understand this proposition. Those who favor the majority report do not understand the problem that confronts them. If we were able to organize the foreign speaking Socialists and immigrants that come over here we would not only have captured Milwaukee, we should have captured Chicago, and every big city in the United States, which are largely foreign cities. In Chicago at least fifty per cent are foreigners. The foreigners control the political destiny of Chicago, they control the political destiny of Milwaukee, they control the political destiny of New York, they control the destiny of every large industrial center in America. When we say to them, "You have no room or place in the Socialist Party," I say they will answer back, "If we have no place in the Socialist Party then we will go out of the American Socialist Party and we will establish the international organization, true to its name, true to its spirit."

The Congress then adjourned until 2 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Behrens called the Congress to order at two o'clock P. M.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Constitution is holding a session this afternoon in the anteroom and has made the request that it be advised before the vote on the question under consideration is taken. If there is no objection the Chair will instruct a messenger to notify the Committee on Constitution before the vote

is taken. Is there any objection? Hearing none, that will be the course of the Chair.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION.

THE CHAIRMAN: The matter now before the Congress is the substitute offered by Comrade Hillquit of New York for the report of the ma-

jority and the report of the minority of the Committee on Immigration.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): If Comrade Untermann's report was a masterpiece of reasoning, Comrade Sparago's speech was a masterpiece of oratory, and I think we are safe in saying that Comrade Hillquit's speech was a masterpiece of plausibility, characteristically so. The fact of the matter is that the substitute, if adopted, will save the face of the majority report in this Congress. I can see no reason why this substitute should become the expression of this Congress in the light of the two reports before us.

A statement has been made with regard to immigration from the Orient, which seems to me absolutely unjustified by the facts. I want to call the attention of the Congress to quotations from the Party Bulletin that appeared in June, 1909, July, 1909, December, 1909, and January, 1910. In June, 1909, there appeared this: "The Japanese plantation laborers in Hawaii have organized to increase wages and better the miserable housing conditions imposed upon them."

In July, 1909, there appeared in the party weekly Bulletin: "As a result of the strike of Japanese plantation laborers of Hawaii several of the strikers have been arrested, the usual charges of conspiracy, inciting to riot and murder being made against them. The plantation owners have announced confidence in the success of their immigration plans, and that their agent, A. J. Campbell, is visiting the Azores and also going to Madeira for the purpose of securing laborers."

In December, 1909, there appeared in the weekly Bulletin: "The United States government officials are supporting the colonization schemes of the plantation owners of Hawaii. As before stated in this column, the Japanese workers who became strikers are considered too high priced, and Russian and Portuguese laborers have been imported. Comrade Kotinski, assistant entomologist in the Federal service at Honolulu, has been discharged for explaining to the Russian workmen the strike situation and the economic conditions."

"As a result of the strike last spring of the Japanese plantation laborers, the plantation owners announced a campaign of stimulated immigration.

In fact, they sent agents to the Azores, Madeira, Russia and elsewhere to secure laborers. They have secured quite a number of Russians, and declare their intention of importing about ten thousand more from that country."

In January, 1910, the following appeared: "On December 31st ninety-four Filipino laborers arrived in Honolulu, they having been imported under contract by the sugar planters' association. The bosses, contrary to agreement, refused to pay for the time occupied in transportation, and placed a charge of \$7 against the amount of \$18 which the laborers would receive after a full month's work." Then what did these Orientals do, who had been brought in to scab on the Japanese? "The Filipinos refused the new terms, and the association agents turned them loose in the town without food, shelter or money." You Americans under similar conditions have usually accepted the terms. These Orientals have given such an important example of solidarity that it was called to your attention through the weekly Bulletin.

Now, we listened to a report here from the comrade recommending practically that while we do not actually specify that in so many words, that in substance we do, by saying this: "I see no reason why we should apologize for the Stuttgart position." I personally and as a Socialist would be ashamed of this congress as a delegate here, if any other proposition is put forward than practically substantiating that position, and I do not care how plausible you may make it. I do not care anything about the wording. If you come in here with a substitute that carries a more restrictive measure, no matter how subtly it may be worded, no matter how cleverly it may be formed along that line, I want to say to you, comrades, that we are going backward, we are not taking a step forward. But there is something more than that. If we are going to take the position advocated by the majority report there is only one consistent policy for us to follow, and that is that we take a position for a high protective tariff, high enough to keep out the products of Oriental labor in its own home countries, and that is to endorse the Republican party. There is no other way; that is all you can do. If we are to be afraid

of these Orientals coming into this country then we must be afraid of their products from their home countries being shipped here, and in addition to endorsing the proposition of the majority report, we must tack on an endorsement of the protective tariff system in order to keep their products from competing with us here in this country.

I want to say to you, my friends, as a native born American, and I say it advisedly, that there is no bigger scab in the world than the American. (Applause.) I know people will charge that that statement was made for a purpose, and that it is demagogic. But it is not; it is a fact.

A DELEGATE: It's true.

DEL. MERRICK: Down at Mc Kee's Rocks, in Allegheny County, where we have almost a quarter million of foreign born people, an Irishman will take the American flag and try to break a strike.

A DELEGATE: That's a fact. (Applause.)

DEL. MERRICK: These comrades over here, the fraternal delegates from the foreign speaking organizations, recognize the fact, recognize the fact that it is a question of class solidarity, and that is the reason they feel the way they do, because they know it to be a fact that, as was said here this morning, if you take any position other than the Stuttgart position it is the beginning of catering to the demands of the A. F. of L. or any kind of an organization that wants to go out and get a few votes by excluding foreigners as a mass from coming to this country. I say there are two ways of forming a labor party in this country. One way is to organize it on the pattern of the A. F. of L. Another way is to come into this Congress and so modify and qualify the Socialist program that it will be acceptable to Sam Gompers and John Mitchell. (Applause.)

DEL. MORGAN: Exactly.

DEL. MERRICK: I do not take the position that one of the comrades took here today, that if you don't do what I want I will leave the Socialist Party. I am going to stay in the Socialist Party, no matter what you do. (Applause.)

A DELEGATE: Good for you!

DEL. MERRICK: It does not make any difference if I do not agree with another single comrade in this

Congress. I recognize the Socialist Party as the expression of the working class in the politics of America. But I plead with you, comrades, this is not the hour and this is not the time for us to take back one jot or one tittle of the declaration which we made in the days when we were much more obscure and when it took more courage. When we are in sight of political victory is not the time to modify our position.

There is another proposition that I want to call to your attention. The charge is made here that the manufacturers of this country want to repeal the exclusion acts. I hold in my hand a copy of last night's Chicago Daily News, with a news item from Washington sent by a staff correspondent, showing that directly the opposite is the case. They want to make it more restrictive. It reads:

"Washington, D. C., May 14.—It is possible that the question of Japanese exclusion may come up before the House at this session. At present there is standing as sixth on the calendar a bill introduced by Representative E. H. Hayes of California, which indirectly will accomplish the purpose, if it should become a law. This bill was introduced in Congress February 8th and was reported back to the House favorably by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization two days later. It has failed to get publicity by reason of its celerity from the bill basket to the House calendar, and it is understood that those most interested in its passage would prefer that no extraordinary publicity be given it at this time."

I hold in my hand Hampton's Magazine for May. On page 733 of it appears an editorial headed "Don't Worry About Japan," which I think may with no great stretch of imagination be applicable here. It says:

"Leslie M. Shaw has been roiling his innocuous desuetude with war whoops about Japan. He should be answered in a brief monosyllable by every sensible man. The monosyllable should be the ex-secretary's own last name. Philander C. Knox has been busying himself with Manchuria. He should be answered with a brief trisyllable. The trisyllable should be his own first name. Look behind the hubbub of war terms and you will find, as usual, Wall Street. The voice is the voice of Jacob Schiff, but the

hand is the hand of Morgan. Strip away the outer covering of talk and you will find that the Manchurian railroad squabble boils down to a simple matter of more profits for the great financial interests of Europe, Japan and America. Our Wall Street brethren fear they will not receive their share. From their anguish at the possible loss of a few millions they yearn for the blood of the Japs. Then, too, it is whispered there is another and a deeper reason for Wall Street's latest outburst at the Mikado's children. This has to do with the increasing ability of the Japs to manufacture steel. One authority declares that the Japanese steel makers are becoming serious competitors of our steel trust. Mr. Morgan, naturally, cannot see anything of that sort occur without making a real fuss. The United States has many domestic problems of far greater importance than the ownership of the Manchurian railways. Let us not be distracted from their settlement by any attack of war to revenge our sad-faced group of Wall Street promoters."

Just supposing that it would happen that Hampton's Magazine is correct and shortly there starts over this country a campaign of publicity to encourage a war with Japan, and you are a tool by which it is accomplished in order to create diplomatic friction with Japan over the exclusion of the Japanese from this country, where are you going to be, and what position are you going to take? When war is declared, you people who do not believe in war, where are you going to be if you have endorsed the very proposition which may prove the means of bringing about war between these countries? Where are you going to land? In the light of these facts, would it be consistent to say, after having endorsed the proposition of excluding these Orientals, we are willing to go out under the stars and stripes and fight our Japanese brothers in order that they may not come into this country? But you take that position in excluding them at this time by this resolution.

The fact of the matter is that it is presumed that by adopting the resolution here or by agitating for political action along this line you are going by some manner of means to raise the standard of living. I think it is certainly a shame, comrades, that the

matter has been put forward under a proposition which the capitalists themselves have used in the past to distract our attention from the real question and issue before the American people. When we are exploited by the capitalist class, to talk about temperance and to say that we are poor because we drink too much and we are poor because too many foreigners come into this country, is all right in a capitalist sense, but I do not think it should have a large place in a Socialist congress. As long as the matter is up, I would like to see a free and fair discussion that would for all time end this question so that it would never again be brought into a Socialist congress and be the means of costing the party thousands of dollars to discuss a question that practically is ignored even by the most reactionary craft unions of the East. (Applause.)

DEL. M'ALLISTER (Mo.): There has been much said upon this all important question. There are many things that ought not to have been said. It has been asserted before this congress that it was a question that there ought not to have been any time spent in discussing. I want to tell you that we are grappling with a question as deep as the foundation of capitalism itself. I am utterly surprised to see a man who has had the love of humanity in his heart to that extent that he claims to be a Socialist, that wants to raise his voice for the expulsion, because of race, of any human being who wants to come to our shores. (Applause.) We are all immigrants. We Americans appear to think that we are IT in great big letters. I want to ask you fellows how long back it has been since your grandfathers came from some foreign country to this country, how long? I want to ask you fellows, who are in favor of this expulsion, I want to know who it is that goes with clubs and guns in times of strikes and beats you and me over the head when trying to get better conditions in this country? I want to tell you, comrades of this congress, that, although the comrades that are in the majority on this question may be perfectly unconscious of it, yet they are acting as a cat's paw in the capitalists' hands to rake out the chestnuts while they eat them. (Applause.)

I got this kind of religion of the plain people down on the old Ozark

Mountains of Missouri. When I sat down on my plow beam and studied this thing over, there was a mental picture that came to me, and the Chinese came to me and the Japanese came to me, and the nationalities all came around me in that old field on the Ozark Mountains, and I said, "We are all of one blood." I went back home and told the folks, and for twenty years I have been preaching the doctrine of human solidarity of the laboring class of people all around this globe; not here in Chicago, not down in Missouri, not here in Illinois, but as far as the sin of capitalism extends, the solidarity of every man, woman and child. (Applause.) I want to see a rising vote upon this question. I would love to see every single delegate in this congress rise and vote for all the human family in this world to have the privileges of all Socialists. The international Socialists declared in their declaration of principles for every one around the world, and let us not stigmatize that with some little, narrow proposition.

I am not afraid of the Chinese, nor of the Japanese, but I am afraid of the capitalists of this country. I am afraid they will rob my grandchildren and my grandchildren's children when I am dead and gone and cannot raise my voice. But I am not afraid of those Orientals coming over here and robbing us. Those fellows are not what you want to go after. The capitalist system is what you want to go after, not these poor people that come across here, that take their jobs, as they say. No, sir. Those are not the people that are the strikebreakers, that they are gathering up by the thousands and shipping over to this country. It is you Americans that are scabbing on you laboring men of this country, not the foreigners. I want to know who are the enemies. That is what I want to know. Let us get right down to bed rock. It is capitalism that we are fighting. I thank you for your attention. (Applause.)

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I desire to move that the substitute resolution offered by Del. Hillquit, of New York, be amended by adding the following words:

"The congress, however, recognizes that at the present time the immigration of Asiatic workers to the United States is not in general

a voluntary immigration of free workers, but is almost wholly a mass importation of cheap labor stimulated by the capitalists for the purpose and with the view of weakening the labor movement and increasing the profits and power of the capitalist class. The absence of specific labor contracts in many cases does not alter the fact. The existence or non-existence of such contracts can seldom be proved in the case of Asiatic immigrants and the existing legal restriction against the importation of contract labor furnishes no safeguard against the evil. We, therefore, hold that under such circumstances the working class of the United States is justified in protecting itself by the exclusion of such immigrants."

If I find a second, I desire to speak to the amendment.

DEL. WHITE (Mass.): I second the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is now properly before the house.

DEL. LEE: Before speaking directly to the amendment, let me speak very briefly about some of the discussions of these motions before us. We have a very strong tendency, we Socialists, to want to make things easy, to pass a general declaration one way or another, without sufficient consideration of the specific facts. We have been told here by Comrade Merrick and by other comrades, that, if we will exclude any immigrants, that we should go to the logical conclusion and exclude all. I want to call your attention to the fact, comrades, that while undoubtedly sincerely meant, that sort of argument is an absolute sophistry. That sort of argument, let us say, is raised on the question of immediate demands. The Socialist Party has taken, and I believe will continue to take, the position that it stands for its whole ultimate program, and at the same time that it stands for certain immediate practicable demands.

Now, the opponents of any immediate demands will say this, "Well, if you are going to advocate any immediate demands, why don't you make it all immediate demands; throw your revolutionary Socialism overboard and go to the logical conclusion?" And on the other hand the extreme opportunists may say this: "Well, if you are not going to go the

whole length on the immediate demands, why don't you just leave the immediate demands out and declare for revolutionary Socialism?" And both of them are wrong, because we have to deal not only with general principles, but with the application of general principles to specific facts at a given time and under existing circumstances.

Furthermore, I want to enter my objection to some pretty loose and exaggerated statements that have been made here, to the effect that Americans are scabs. (Applause.) I believe that it is just as false to say that—I do not say that it is any more false—but it is just as false, as to say that all Americans are infidels. I do not want to accuse the comrade who said that of demagogic, for possibly what he said was not demagogic. But I ask you to consider seriously whether it does not closely verge upon demagogic for one to announce that he is an American and then to proceed, on the strength of the air of impartiality which that gives, to announce that Americans are the greatest scabs on earth, and that therefore, because Americans are scabs, the Chinese exclusion act ought to be repealed.

Now, I would like, if there was time, to criticize a good deal of the other discussion that has gone on up to the present time. The first part of the objection is this. We have an important report with which I for one, and I believe there are many others, am not altogether satisfied, yet I heartily endorse what Comrade Hillquit said about that report and the address that was made in support of it. I believe this is a subject, the results of the study of which ought to go before the Socialist Party with the various questions connected with it. I am not altogether satisfied with that report, partly because it seems to me it is not as emphatic as it might be to accord that general principle of working class solidarity which is of inestimable value.

I am utterly dissatisfied with the minority report, in the first place because it specifically declares in favor of the principle of exclusion in general terms and then proceeds to say that we must not apply this principle at the present time, because there isn't any problem of Asiatic exclusion in the United States. Now, I do not like the general approval of the principle of

exclusion of races, and emphatically I do not like the declaration that there is no Asiatic immigration labor problem in the United States, because there is, and it is a misstatement of fact. (Applause.)

So far as it goes I am better satisfied with Comrade Hillquit's substitute than with either the resolution of the majority or of the minority. But Comrade Hillquit's substitute as it stands would put us on record in favor of the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law; at least I think that is the way 99 people out of every 100 would read it. I do not think that we ought to go on record in that way; not as some delegates have intimated. And I submit to them that when I say that, I do not impugn the motives of other delegates; I shall not proceed to impugn their motives by telling them that we are afraid of truckling to the Federation of Labor, that we are going down on our hands and knees to Gompers and Mitchell, that we are afraid of offending the labor unions. I protest that I do not speak from any fear of Gompers and Mitchell, or even the trade unions of this country, but I do speak from what, in my view, upon such knowledge as I have been able to gather, is to the best interest of the labor movement of this country, and it is something bigger than the Socialist Party, bigger than the labor unions, as big as the working class. I do not consider that the interest of the labor movement of this country is inconsistent with the labor movement of the world.

Therefore, I want appended to Comrade Hillquit's substitute, if it is adopted, a specific declaration of fact as I believe the fact to be, and it is for you to judge, each of you, whether you consider that that statement of fact is correct; that under existing circumstances Asiatic labor immigration to this country is not free immigration, but, in accordance with the very spirit of the Stuttgart resolution, is a mass importation of labor, stimulated by the capitalists and directed against the labor movement.

Now, comrades, for my part I think that we Socialists are a little too much given to think that we have to pass resolutions to settle the questions of the country and of the world. I do not think our resolutions do settle those questions. If we were to declare against Chinese exclusion, would

it result in repealing the Chinese exclusion law? No, because the capitalists of this country, who would very well like to see the Chinese exclusion law repealed, know that they do not dare to do it in face of even the half conscious working class of this country. (Applause.) We would not get the Chinese exclusion law repealed, we would not do one iota of good to the Chinese or any other Asiatics by passing such a resolution. What we would do would be to put ourselves in a false position before this country.

On the other hand, I do not know whether it is particularly desirable to have a declaration against the admission of Asiatics, and I would have been willing, and I think many would be willing, that we should not pass a resolution upon those questions which as a matter of fact we have no power to decide. I do believe that when we take up the immigration question it ought to be on the positive lines laid down in the Stuttgart resolution, of working with the labor movement and Socialist movement of this country, as part of the Socialist movement of the world, and doing something to-day to counteract the work of that vast system of emigration agents in the service of the steamship companies and the employers, who are at work all over the world deceiving people and entrapping them into this country, bringing them to America, where just as soon as they begin to demand better wages, they are turned loose to serve as strikebreakers. We have that condition in every part of the country. We have those people being exploited and being oppressed and being degraded, and we have those people's lives being destroyed in the steel mills of this town and many other places because it is cheaper for the capitalists to kill an immigrant who has no family here to claim damages or to cause trouble about it, than it is to kill a man who has some friends or a family that will claim damages or at any rate make an attempt to. I do believe that our movement ought to do some positive work on those lines. We haven't any such proposition before us. I hope that at Copenhagen we will have and that we shall have some action.

I would have been willing to have this question of the admission or exclusion of Asiatic immigrants laid aside as a question that this congress

cannot determine and has no particular reason for dealing with. We cannot do that, because two years ago here three years ago at Stuttgart, and six years ago here and in Amsterdam, the question was raised and raised from the side of those who wanted to get an emphatic and unqualified declaration in favor of the admission of Oriental immigration. The question having been raised in that way, those of us who were opposed to that position cannot let it rest. It is for those reasons that I shall favor the adoption of my amendment to Comrade Hillquit's substitute, and if it is adopted, shall then vote for Comrade Hillquit's substitute as amended. If Comrade Hillquit's substitute is not amended, or, having been amended, is not adopted, then I do not see that that we can do anything else but vote for the majority report, with which, as I say, I am by no means altogether satisfied.

DEL. MAYNARD (Colo.): Comrades, it is in this question more than in any other, perhaps, in this congress, that we have to justify our existence as a congress. If we are all convinced already as to just what we are going to do on this matter, if we feel that we know without a question what is the truth on this, and if all of you have felt so from the beginning, then those who voted against the congress were right, and we never ought to have come together. Unless we are capable of being convinced when facts come before us, unless we come to these congresses open-minded upon everything except such principles as have been settled fundamentally, then we might better stay away. We are here to learn and face the facts. I do not know how I am going to vote on this until we get through and find out how the thing sums up. I wish it were possible again to resubmit it to a commission, perhaps after the manner that the last speaker suggested, for we should meet these questions in some way.

Let me call your attention to some of the facts we are ignoring apparently, some of the facts we have got to face. Do we or do we not want to be a part of the labor movement of America? Do we want simply to satisfy ourselves with a fine appreciation of our own ideals and our own sentiments and know that we are consistent theorists from the ground up,

and feel that that justifies our existence to the end of time, whether we ever help the working class on to victory or not? We must realize that the thing to-day is not to applaud fine statements, but to face the facts as we meet them and to know what is best.

Now, I have been disappointed in having listened for more than half a day, and having had absolutely no facts presented except one or two from the speaker immediately prior to the last one, on the original report and its exposition.

The position of the majority report has all been the assertion of principles. Well, the Socialist Party, if a scientific party at all, is a party that bases its principles upon facts, and we want to have these facts. Comrade Untermann has given us a vast array of them, and perhaps prepared a vast amount of facts that have not been given. Now it is these things that we want to know, and I hope those that discuss hereafter will not repeat forever all these platitudes about immigrants. I am utterly disgusted in the persons who spoke for the minority report, talking about immigrants and immigrants and immigrants. What do we mean by that? All of us are immigrants or our forefathers before us. That is not the question. We know it is not the question; therefore why do we talk that kind of nonsense?

The question is whether the peculiar condition in the Orient is not such as to be a menace to the Western coast. Out there what do we find? We find that the Socialist Party has been as alien to the labor movement on the coast as if it had no existence whatever. They have stood against the prejudices of everybody in the labor movement on the coast. I have lived there a number of years. Before I went there my prejudices were all the other way. I believed so thoroughly in the brotherhood of man when there was not a Socialist there, that I hadn't any patience with exclusion of Asiatics or anybody else. But then I was a theorist. Now, I hope, I am a scientific Socialist. (Applause.) The real thing that we have got to face is the facts. If we are going to work with the labor movement at all, if we are to have any influence when coming in contact with it, we must not take a position that seems to be utterly contrary to what is for their interest on these questions. Now, did you notice

in this substitute amendment the statement that Comrade Hillquit there made? He says, we are not facing action in Congress at Washington, Oh, no. We are just satisfying a movement that has been used to phrases, and we will give them phrases some more. When we get into Congress, then we will face the facts as they are. But, if Comrade Hillquit is put in Congress next fall, as I very much hope he will be, we do not want him to be tied hand and foot by a resolution that we have adopted at this time. We do not want any of our congressmen to be in there—and we are going to have a number of them next fall—and have them handicapped by our action on the most fundamental thing, and that the one thing that the labor unions have been able on the coast to build up, a united movement that did work on the coast, and that the labor unions of New York have been able to realize the problems of the labor unions of California. Socialists see them from afar; they have not had them nearby. But the Socialists of California at least have been able to face the facts as they are there. In other words, frankly, friends, what we want to do here is not to reaffirm our high convictions. I want to have the opinions of all of you. I want to have the facts and do the things that seem most in sympathy with the actual needs of the working class.

A number have talked about the West being a small thing. California itself is a good deal larger place than a great many of these European countries that you talk about as being so authoritative in our movement. America is a big place. Why handicap the work of the western coast in any such fashion as we have been trying to? I appeal to you that you leave this thing alone as something that we are not ready to deal with yet, or else in some fashion make us understand what is for the interest of the working class who are actually in the working class battle of to-day and then meet it in that way.

It is not a question, mind you, of our sympathy with the Chinese and the Japanese. Some said this morning that they would send our people over to teach them. Well, I hope they will, because they will have to develop in capitalism, and I hope they will learn better than at our own doors. It is all right, and therefore they will

get their education. But to say that people hundreds of years behind our civilization in certain ways and in an utterly different social development can come at once to our country and master and meet our problems in the same way as ourselves is utterly Utopian.

Another thing, you talk as if exclusion was something utterly new. You say the problem is not pressing. Why is it not pressing? For fifteen years at least they have had an anti-Chinese and anti-Japanese immigration law out there. They have enforced it as well as they could, with the whole Western coast trying to help them enforce it. In spite of that they have let in thousands upon thousands of people, so the problem is a real one now in spite of the exclusion act.

What would it be if the bars were down entirely? You do not face the facts. They talk here as though it were a new thing. This problem is here already. The question is, shall the bars be thrown down, bars that were reared by the urgent insistence and pressure of the united working people of the west? Now, must the Socialists, in order to prove their own loyalty to their a priori theories, refuse to face the facts? If it is our duty to alienate forever the working people of this country in order that we may prove our fine working class theories, then all right, but this phase of things must be met at every turn, everywhere. We cannot settle things by phrases. We must settle them by application of principles to given facts, and I believe that this congress is going to do it. I believe that they are going to be able to readjust their convictions on everything, if necessary, in order to get at the real truth. Conditions are as they are to-day. I will admit that I do not know what they are. I want to find out. But if it is necessary to take this action at this time in order not only to help out the conditions of the working class, but to help break down the barrier that divides us from the trade unions, I say we ought to do it. We must be scientific facers of facts, and not self-laudatory appreciators of fine phrases.

DEL. M'DERMOTT (Mont.): Comrades, I am not going to try to spiel any oratory, because I agree fully with the comrade that has just spoken, that it is facts that are needed. I happen to come from a state that has been

practically on the firing line, you might say on the skirmish line. And before I tell my little story I want to say this, that there has been a great deal of evidence brought out that came from those wells of information about which there is no chance of a doubt, from the capitalist press. Now, when it comes to talking of the capitalist press, I would say that it is absolutely unreliable in any way, shape, or manner, because we have had evidence right here that the same paper contradicts itself. I want to say that from the Socialist press I can take evidence, but I cannot take it from the associated press dispatches as a general rule.

It has been asserted here that these foreigners have shown a class solidarity which the American has not. Now, I claim that they have shown a national solidarity and not a class solidarity. I believe the statements of the parties that made those statements will prove that. You will find almost invariably that where these foreigners have been scabbed on by Americans and where the foreigners have shown such class solidarity, it has been generally of one nation on another. Now, let me illustrate that if I can.

Out in Great Falls there was a lot of Greeks brought in. They were brought in by way of Chicago here. They were promised \$1.50 a day. Out in that country \$1.50 a day is equal to about 75 cents a day here. As I say, \$1.50 represents pretty good wages out there. But, anyhow, they came out there all together to take the places of American citizens who refused to scab. We have a class of people called blanket stiffs. I am going to try to explain the blanket stiff to you people before I get through. They quit because they would not work for those wages. When the company got the Greeks out there they refused to pay them the \$1.50 a day, but paid them only \$1.25. They immediately went out on strike, and the company pulled them out from Great Falls and pulled them up the line and dumped them out on the prairie; and I will say that they did show a method of handling immediate demands that the Socialist Party has failed to realize. They took crowbars and they pulled up two rails from the main line. The next train that came along stopped, for a very good reason, and the result was that they got their \$1.50 a day. Now, that was not show-

ing class solidarity by any means; it was showing national solidarity. They struck, and they struck like men all together. There was not a failure among all of them. They went right out together, but it was not for their class; it was for the Greeks that were in that trainload. That was the idea.

Now, these Greeks are being displaced, being displaced by Japs. When I went out to Great Falls twelve years ago there was hardly a Jap along the road. Just previous to my going there there had been trouble in Great Falls. We have no Chinamen in that town. Chinamen won't go there to stay, because Great Falls is known in China as an extremely unhealthy climate. Whether it is right or wrong I am not going to stop to say. They were driven out of town at one time, and they failed to report for duty when the roll was called. As I say, when I went out there, there were very few Japs along the road. The people were mostly Greeks and Italians.

Now, let me tell you how they bring them out there. You easterners do not understand the method that they use. They bring them out there in great trainloads in what they call bunk cars. They are simply box cars that are fitted up with a bunk for you to sleep in. The men hire their own cook and the food is brought to them in charge of their companies, or rather their combination, so that they live very cheaply. Their sanitary conditions are magnificent, as you can imagine, and also the company that they keep aside from human beings. You can imagine those cars. Your tenement house districts are perhaps a parallel. They are no worse. The conditions under which those people live are something terrible. Now those men came out there and they had driven the Americans off those railroads, that is, off from the laboring work. They had driven them off and the Americans had become blanket stiffs, and these blanket stiffs are terribly embittered against the men who have driven them out from their positions. Now, those people gradually came in along the line of the Great Northern. They came in on a few jobs. They didn't stretch them out a thousand or two thousand miles all over the system, but they brought them gradually down the line. This month there would be a section crew here, and next month, ten or twelve

miles further along. There would be another section crew a little further, and another one, and finally, after the railroads had felt their way, they got the trainloads of Japanese laborers to handle the shortcuts and the new work and all of it. Now those Japanese laborers are intelligent men; there can be no question about it. I have had them come in where I worked and I have seen many of them, and while they could talk very little English, they could talk to me enough so that I could understand that they knew practically as much as I did, but they could not express it. I happen to be a machinist and engineer, and they would come into my engine room and look around over the engine and as you can readily understand, I could see by the way they walked around that engine that they knew what they were doing and that they understood that machinery. And what were they doing on the railroads? They were looking for a job; that is all.

Now, those men never intermingle with the other people. They come there in those cars and they are displacing the Greek who displaced the white man. They come in there in those cars and live by themselves. Their food is fetched to them by a trading company; the same outfit, or rather a branch of the same outfit that brings them in on contract, and they buy very little from the districts in which they are living.

And another thing that I want you to mark is this. While I was there they would bring in three or four or five thousand at a time in trainloads, two and three trains of them, and the job might last maybe three months; that was the limit, and then they were pulled out and sent to some other job and another batch of Japs were brought in. What was that for? It was simply, so far as I could see and the only way I can figure it out, to keep them moving so that while they are in America there will be no opportunity of learning the ways of the people of the district which they are in. But they certainly do keep them moving. Now then, the blanket stiff; what is a blanket stiff? Do you easterners understand it? He is a man that rolls up two blankets on his shoulder and starts right straight out over the prairie along the railroad track, where perhaps the first settlement is twenty, thirty, sometimes fifty

miles ahead of him, and he hasn't got a bite to eat in his pocket, very often. He is a man that has refused to accept work under capitalistic conditions and take a lower standard of living than what he has set for himself. That is what the blanket stiff is. And often he is a man of intelligence. If he happens to be a laborer, that does not hurt his brain at all. He can see the injustice of the thing and he can see who is hurting him. He does not become a Socialist, though there are lots of them that are Socialists just the same. But your philosophy cannot reach him because he cannot vote. He cannot vote, and he is outside of you entirely. Now, you have to give that man a chance. You have to give that class a chance to be able to get and retain something out of your philosophy or you will never touch him.

Now then, as I say, these Japs are displacing the Greek, and the Greek displaced the Americans, and if the Socialist movement is to go on, then to the best of my understanding it has got to go on with intelligence and not with brute force. Now, are you going to try to carry the Socialist movement along by bringing the intelligent man, or rather the semi-intelligent man, at once up to a position that has taken us in America years to build up? And are you going to allow the people of a country that are many years behind us to come here and lower us still further, just simply to preserve that which you say is the Stuttgart position? I cannot see it. Or are we going to go to work and stop that class from coming in and allow our citizens to maintain the standard of intelligence, the standard of living which they have already grasped.

Now, they say wages are too high on the coast. It has not been the Socialists' fault, there is no question about that. You can talk all you please about what the Socialists have done, but it has been the act of the individuals in the unions, the masses of the people with Socialistic ideas in their heads, and they have forced the capitalist class out there to maintain the wages which they have.

Now then, here is the idea. Out there it is a crying need, it is an immediate proposition. It is just the same in the east, I do not doubt. To tell you the honest truth, there isn't anybody there that is strong enough to withstand it. I would like to see

this thing carried, taken up and planed out as it should be. But I want it to be definite. The fact is that the western country is filled with men, good, strong, hearty men that are fighters from the backbone out, from the ground up. There is no question about their fighting abilities. And as far as the matter of scabs is concerned, there are all kinds of Americans. I guess it is an even shakeup. I have been scabbed on by just as many Americans as foreigners. I cannot give the foreigner any the best of it at all here. It is only natural that a class prejudice should spring up there under these conditions. This question is vital out there, and it is not for tomorrow or the next day to settle it. It is now that we are to show our sympathy. Now, that is all we can do, and we ought to show our sympathy with the struggling proletarians of America, and not those in Japan or China or any other country. (Applause.)

DEL KAPLAN (Minn.): I have been on the minority side before, but I do not know whether I will be on the minority side today. However, I am against the majority report. The basis, as I understand it, of the international, philosophical and materialistic Socialist philosophy is the class struggle, and from that standpoint we take it that capitalism is international. Wherever capitalism exists, there the class struggle exists, there the working class is exploited. I want, before I forget it, to mention this: that it was the capitalistic civilization and the Caucasian race that in the first great battle opened the doors of India, of Japan and of China. We did not touch upon that proposition. The white man came there, and he came there against the will of the Hindoo, against the will of the Japanese, against the will of the Chinese. They refused to open up their doors. We insisted that they open their doors; yes, we, from the standpoint that we are big, the Caucasian race. All right; the capitalists were living under capitalism; the capitalists insisted upon opening the doors. The capitalist class opened the doors there and did what? Forced themselves in, forced the workers in those nations, in those localities, to look elsewhere for bread. Do you think, any one of you, that a man, I do not care what his color, creed or nationality may be, desires to

leave his place of birth, desires to leave the people whom he knows, or with whom he has associated in life, leave them behind him and go somewhere else just for the mere pleasure of the thing? No. He does so because of the economic system. He does so because he is driven to do it.

That is one of the things we overlook. I want to say, comrades, I think this is a question of vital, of most momentous importance. I think we ought to make our position clear as Socialists, and not perhaps as r-r-revolutionists, that the working class the world over should be a unit because the capitalist class the world over is a unit. Now, simply because the American Federation of Labor of the United States have taken a position showing that they do not recognize the actual causes of the conditions that make them and keep them exploited, we need not say that therefore we must toady to them. We can be with them in their strikes, in their lock-outs, in every endeavor to better their material conditions, but we have also got to say to them on questions such as this, "Here is the problem of the class struggle, and this is why we exist. This is why the Hindoo is coming here. This is why the Chinaman is coming here. This is why the Japanese is coming here."

Comrades, I want to ask this question of you: Did you ever hear of men coming to this country from localities where capitalism does not exist? Did you ever hear of the Eskimo coming into this country? Did you ever hear of men away down in Terra del Fuego coming here? No; capitalism does not yet exist there. They have not as yet been driven from those places. When capitalism comes there you will find those fellows driven to look somewhere else for a place to live and a place to rest their heads upon. Comrades, I want to say to you that capitalism is wise. It sends religion ahead of it. It sends its missionaries to China to Christianize the Chinese. It sends its missionaries to Japan to Christianize the Japanese. It sends its missionaries over there, and then they get up Boxer riots and so on. Then their ships, their navies and armies come, and then some sort of insurrection, something starts up, some Christian is killed, and then we have the ports thrown open, or rather the ports open and here

comes our Christian civilization, or, in other words, our capitalistic civilization, and each takes a slice, each wants a slice, each must have a slice. I want to ask you, what slices are taken by those that are left there? It is not taken for us, but ask Mr. Morgan, ask Mr. Rockefeller, ask the banking interests of the country and of the world, who gets the benefit? Who are the beneficiaries always? The capitalistic elements of all countries. And the peculiar pity of it all, I want to say, is that the labor organizations, the American Federation of Labor and so on, do not seem to recognize that. Why? Simply because the American Federation of Labor says so, we, the Socialist movement, should also say yes.

We heard comrades speak about the backward races. In 1893 there was a congress of religions held right here in the city of Chicago. The Hindoos were there, the Chinamen were there, and the Japanese were there, and among the men with the greatest minds, with the most idealistic imaginations, the men who stood for advanced principles, for humanitarianism, the men who made the best speeches on those subjects, were not the Christians, men of the Christian denominations. They were these Hindoos, these Japanese and these Chinamen. And yet we hear Comrade Untermann, who has been living with the same Chinese, speak about the backwardness of these races. They say it is not a question of economics, but of race antipathy. It is a matter of race antipathy, Comrade Untermann. But I want to say to you that Socialism does not necessarily imply social equality. It means economic equality. I can work side by side with a black man, a yellow man and a red man, and I agree that they should receive the same wages as I, even under capitalism. Yet I can say when I leave the factory or the mine or the mill, I can go back to my particular associates, and yet I can be just as good a Socialist as the best, simply because of economic equality. Ultimately, perhaps, we will have social equality, Comrade Untermann. We are not compelled to associate one with another in the home. You are not compelled to marry a colored woman if you do not like to do so. (Laughter.) He also mentions another thing, the middle class. He says, as between the

middle class and the capitalist class, in other words, as between the small fry and the great big fry, he would rather take a situation by the side of the small fry. I want to say, although I am one of the small fry, you will only reach, you will only attain the goal that you and I are aiming for, when capitalism will have developed to that extent in industry, both production and distribution, as to have eliminated that middle class. Comrade Untermann is very anxious and desires to save the fellows at the bottom. I would save the fellows at the top. If I could tomorrow decide as to whether the trust magnates, the fellows at the top, or the little fellows should have a chance, as to which of the two should have a chance, I would say as between the big fellow and the little fellow, I want the big fellow. Why? Because the big fellows are few. The middle class, after all, are more numerous, but numerically they are far larger in proportion than ever before. Now, I contend that it is to the interest of our movement to make use of every endeavor to crush out the little class, the parasitical middle class, and it is our duty and our interest to do so. In Washington, in California, all of the middle class are up in arms in favor of the exclusion of the Japanese. Why? They are driving these little fellows out of business. You did not touch on that, Comrade Untermann, did you? I thought he was an international. I think we Socialists recognize that we have no country that we can call our own, but as Tom Paine said, "All the world is my country." My country, yes. But we do not merely want this to be my country; we want the world to be our country. (Applause.)

I say, comrades, if you want a real sensible resolution, as between the majority and the minority reports, I favor the minority; but as between the three I am in favor of Comrade Hillquit's substitute. But I wish to make this suggestion or recommendation: If you want the strongest recommendation to the trade union movement, say this: That if you don't want the Hindoos and Japanese and Chinese to come here, you say to the capitalist class, "Get out of China, get out of Japan, get out of India," and then after that is done, if then the Chinese and the Hindoos and the Japanese come here, then it is time to talk about ex-

cluding those fellows, but not before. (Applause.)

At this point the chairman was asked to rule on whether a substitute for the whole would be admissible. Several points of order were raised and it was finally brought out that Delegate Goebel had, in a previous session, moved that the minority report be substituted for the majority report and that therefore Delegate Lee's motion was admissible as an amendment to the amendment.

The chair stated that he believed all the delegates desired to give the widest latitude to the discussion and gave the floor to Comrade Hunter.

COM. HUNTER: We have all been very much charmed today by the oratorical efforts of many of our friends and I am not going to attempt at all to compete with them on that field. It would be utterly impossible, and so I shall try to the best of my ability to stick to a few rather important facts.

For some twelve years I spent most of my time among immigrants to this country. I lived for about two years in the Chicago Stockyards. I lived for about a year on the west side of Chicago, and I lived from the time I left college, for about ten years at any rate, all of the time among foreign speaking peoples. Now I could not but have observed certain things regarding this immigration question while living in those communities. I certainly made a study of the influence of immigration upon the condition of labor in this country, and I was impressed by certain things. Now, like my friend, Mrs. Maynard, I was at the beginning a sentimentalist. I utterly refused to conceive of the thought that I should ever attempt to put my hand up to prevent the entry in this country of any one who wanted to come.

I had at various times during those years gone from one extreme to the other. I felt so sympathetic, so unhappy over the conditions of labor in Europe, and the condition of many of the wretched immigrants that came here, that I was impressed by the sentiments of Jacob Riis, Charles W. Eliot and the Civic Federation and many other good friends on the other side who believed that every one should have an opportunity to work when he wanted, where he wanted, for any wages he wanted, any place, at any time. But President Eliot, of Harvard, and I differ on this question

now. As I became more of a Socialist, as I began to understand the class struggle, as I began to see that there was a fight between the working class in this country and of all other countries against the capitalist class, I began to see that I had to stand with one side or the other; that I might talk about the brotherhood of man, that I might talk a great many sentimental phrases, that I might say that I believed with every other man that we ought to have equal opportunities; yet I do say that a lot of that sentiment is mere bosh for the purpose of protecting capitalism and for the purpose of protecting capitalistic exploiters in their effort to exploit labor. (Applause.)

Now, Charles W. Eliot says the scab is a hero and that we should not interfere with the scab doing anything he pleases, that the closed shop is a crime, that any attempt to organize men together for the purpose of protecting their own interests, and to make prices rise like an aeroplane, is utterly impossible until you break this tyranny of labor and crush the labor revolt.

Now, as a Socialist and as a believer in the class struggle, I have come to the conclusion that if there is any one thing we have got to do as a Socialist Party and as Socialists, it is to fight for everything in the interest of the working class here about us, those that we know, those that are in our own fields, wherever we happen to be, against every other power whatsoever. (Applause.) And I have come to the conclusion that anything that tends to degrade labor, to injure it mentally, morally, or physically, is something that we have got to fight and combat.

Now, here are some things that I saw. In the Chicago Stockyards every week there would arrive from Ellis Island hundreds of immigrants with tags on the outside of their clothing and addressed to Armour & Co. They came to the station here, and an agent met them and they went down in the Chicago Stockyards. I saw in the Chicago Stockyards for two years twice the number of working people that they required at any time in that district. I saw at the same time that Armour & Co. and the other people in the beef trust were employing half of these workers for three or four hours a day and another half for three or

four hours a day, and training both bands of workers so that it was simply impossible for them to be organized, and if they attempted to organize they were thrown out of their jobs and there were always plenty of others to take their jobs and destroy their organization.

The same thing has happened in every district of this country. We have seen the Irish taking the places of the American born, and we have seen the American born fighting the Irish and the Irish have won and taken the jobs, and the Americans have moved on. And then we have seen the Irish to a certain extent organizing and becoming more revolutionary and fighting the capitalists, and about the time they reach that point the Italians come in and take their places. Then the organization broke up and the Irish moved on and became the blanket stiff. He moved on to the west and to the other fields. Then, when the Italians became revolutionary and began to form their organizations, to become conscious of their class and try to improve the condition of all, another group of workers came on behind them. The organization was broken again, and the Italians went to new fields of labor. Now, that has happened again and again in the history of America.

I know that this is a fact: that 7,000 agents are at work in Italy alone trying to induce Italians to come over here. Why are there 7,000 agents in Italy telling the Italians there that if they will sell everything they possess and come over to this country they can have gold in plenty? These 7,000 agents are constantly working there for certain reasons; first, that all the big trusts of this country who are the great employers of all kinds of foreign labor are in league with the American steamship companies to induce as much foreign labor as possible to come over here for the purpose of breaking down the unions, for the purpose of making it impossible for the working class to fight, for the purpose of bringing into this country many non-voters, which also to a certain extent breaks down the Socialist revolt. And they are having this influence, besides; the steamship companies have got to carry these men in order to live at all. They have got to have so much cattle in the holds of the ships in order to pay dividends to the steamship trust. (Ap-

plause.) So every time one of those great big steamers comes over the Atlantic the hold has to be filled with human freight that will pay dividends to the Steamship trust.

Now, I used to know very intimately one of the men who did a great deal to organize the steel trust, and I have talked with him and with other friends at various times. He told me once that it would be utterly impossible for the labor organizations to ever get into the steel trust. He said, "It is utterly impossible. They will never make any headway in the steel trust." I asked him why. He finally said, "We have a little recipe by which it will make it impossible. In every group of workmen in the steel trust we have 5 per cent Irish, 10 per cent Italians, 15 per cent Croatians, 20 per cent Greeks." I do not remember the percentages, but something like that. "These men of many nations work in the same places, in the same kinds of work, and," he says, "it is impossible to organize them because they all hate each other like the devil."

Last year I was down in the Tennessee Iron & Coal Co. place at Birmingham, Alabama. I went there among the negroes and the whites, mostly native born whites and native born negroes. When I went among the negroes I found the most terrible state of affairs. It has never been properly described by anybody in this country. I talked with the leaders of the miners there, and the leaders say they have had to give up trying to organize the men in the Tennessee Iron & Coal Co. The Tennessee Iron & Coal Co. hires about a dozen agents who are going all the time among the whites and saying, one to another: "Here, our white friends, the white workingmen are getting too revolutionary, they are giving us too much trouble, and we have heard from Pittsburg, or from New York, that the Board of Directors are very likely to change in a short time the kind of labor we have here and introduce only negro labor." Now, the white workman in the Tennessee Iron & Coal Company is constantly scared, afraid that he may be thrown out at any time, turned out of there with his family, and that negro workmen will be employed.

At the same time other agents are going among the negroes, and if they find out that the negroes are becoming discontented and won't work hard

enough, they are told that the whites produce more work than they do and that all the negroes there are going to be displaced with white labor. As a result the union men who wanted to get the negroes organized and tried to do everything in their power to get over this race feeling, have been utterly unable to organize the Tennessee Iron & Coal Company. Through this very same method they have managed to a certain extent to break up the Miners' union which was at one time well organized in Birmingham, Alabama.

Now, friends, it seems to me this is a simple proposition. Our movement is based upon the class struggle. We have got to stand definitely for the interests of the working class. We have got to fight with the workers wherever they are, trying to improve their condition now as well as in the future. The attempt to improve and better the condition of the working class is the one guiding principle, at least, which animates me in every bit of my activity, and I believe which animates all Socialists. (Applause.) That is the greatest message that all our Socialist thinkers have ever given to us. That is the thing that gave birth to Socialism. That is the thing that gave birth to the international movement. That is the thing that has built up our international movement, and it is a thing that no resolution of the international movement can destroy. I would say to the foreigners who come here, "You ought not to come here;" if I could, I would say this, and publish it broadcast, and if the working class of the world were generally Socialists and they would hear me, I would say: "Brothers of Japan and of China and of Germany, we are here in a fierce fight for our lives against capitalism. We are fighting in the Stockyards, in Pittsburg, and all over this country. For God's sake do not come here now and break down our standard of living and help to fight the battle of those who are fighting us." And if the working class of the world were conscious, they would say that they would not flood the American market with men who, though unconscious of the fact, are to a certain extent blacklegs and scabs. Now, we cannot settle this question to the satisfaction of everybody. I have tried to give you such facts as I know, and I could give you many more. But I just want to say

this, that I do not believe we ought to draw in the lines.

I am against the majority report. I am also absolutely against the minority report, which I think is purely sentimentalism and utopianism. I believe that the only thing we can do to get out of our trouble now, as the matter has been introduced, is to adopt Comrade Hillquit's substitute, which practically reaffirms the international position, yet enables us to do whatever is necessary to protect the class interests of the workers of America. I am also against the substitute as offered by Comrade Lee. (Applause.)

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): Comrades in discussing this report have stated that if they had it in their power they would vote against any immigration unless they were political refugees. At the present stage of the political game in America I don't know but what that idea is a good one. I don't want you to think that I am opposed to any race. I want to agree with the comrade from Duluth when he said, we have no home. No; but some of us have a suit of clothes and perhaps a couple of blankets and we don't want to lose them.

A DELEGATE: Some of us have installment homes not yet paid for.

DEL. DE BELL: If we become blanket stiff we can't get even the installment houses to let us have the use of their goods.

I am opposed to the minority report. I don't exactly like the majority report. I certainly like it better than the minority report. I do not like Comrade Hillquit's substitute because it looks like a straddle, because I don't like to straddle this question. However, I prefer to see that adopted by this congress rather than the minority report.

Regardless of what we may say against organized labor, the organized labor of this country has benefited the working class. It has raised their standard of living. It has decreased the hours of labor. It has compelled the owning class to recognize the working class as having some rights. But when the information was given to Comrade Spargo that the cigar makers boycotted the Chinese, and afterwards organized them, and when he says that he was told this by an official of the Cigar Makers' Union I want to say that the official did not know what he was talking about. The Cigar Makers'

Union does not bar the acceptance of Chinese members; it does bar what? It does bar the admission of the Chinese coolie to this country. That feature has not been touched upon in this congress yet. It is the Chinese coolie that is the menace to the western coast, and will be a menace to the eastern coast. He spoke of his information as to the Belgians. In Local 33 we have about 600 Belgians who are cigar makers, 200 of whom are women, and 400 of whom are men. There is not a more loyal body of men on earth than that body of Belgians in Boston. That same body of Belgians in Boston saved the day when some of our Americans would have conceded the conditions that stood a year ago, when we were struggling with our private exploiters there. There is an element in the cigar trade who probably gave Comrade Spargo his information, who are opposed to the Belgians because they cannot put the Belgian votes in their pockets, and they know that most of them are Socialists or socialistically inclined.

A DELEGATE: What has that to do with exclusion anyhow?

DEL. DE BELL: It has this to do with this question of exclusion, that the Asiatics that we are opposed to coming into this country, the Chinese and the Japs, are coolie slaves, the great majority. Do you know what that is? I will tell you if you don't. He is in fact a criminal of those countries and he pays a part of his earnings to his government, and if it happens to be Japan it goes direct to the Mikado, and if it happens to be China it goes direct to the Empress Dowager of China. That is the real condition you are up against. That is the class of immigrant that is coming from the east and you can't deny it.

A DELEGATE: Have you any proof of it?

DEL. DE BELL: Yes; all you want if you will look for it. I have not got it here but I can get it.

A DELEGATE: We want it.

DEL. DE BELL: Go over to the library over here. It is a fact and you can see it demonstrated if you will take a trip on the Union Pacific or on the Northern Pacific. Go into the railroad camps and see them living on ten cents' worth of rice. Do you want to do that? I don't. I do not intend to. I am a Socialist because I don't want to do that. And I am going to

oppose that class of people coming in here as immigrants. I am not opposed to them as free working men; but I am opposed to them coming in here as servile subjects of a foreign emperor, on condition of paying a proportion of their earnings for their liberty. So far as that is concerned, comrades, we may adopt any laws that we want, but if the capitalists don't want to enforce them they won't be enforced. The capitalist class knows no law that conflicts with their profits; knows no intelligence, no morality, no God, except their God of Dollars, but as a delegate to this congress I do not stand to legislate on what capitalists might or might not do. I want to legislate on what we as a working class party should do to maintain and improve the present environment of the working class, pending the overthrow of the whole capitalist system. I do not believe it is necessary to lower our environment to advance Socialism in America. I do not believe that the Stuttgart resolution takes into account our peculiar situation. It is evident that no other country on earth is up against the immigration problem as America is.

Now, comrades, I want to say this: some kind of a resolution will be adopted here. And I want to say that if this congress does adopt a resolution standing for the unrestricted immigration of Asiatics you need not look to the trades unions for converts for many years to come. You can whistle if you want to, but I know what I am talking about, I know the crowd in the unions that are opposed to Socialism, and I know that nothing you can do will help so much to give that crowd a further lease of life than to go out of here with an indefinite resolution on this subject. But I say to you that if the Socialist Party at this particular period shows its desire to raise the environment of the workers of this country, to assist them in their struggles, in their efforts to give themselves and their children a little better condition of life, to help them in some of their efforts to combat the flood of coolie labor that is coming in on them at the present time, then you will command their attention; when you get their attention then you will get their sympathy, and you will develop their intelligence and attain their support, but you won't do it by dealing with this matter sentimentally, or by taking

the action that we are told we should take by those who know nothing of the facts of the situation.

DEL. GOEBEL: I rise for information. I desire to know if at any time during this debate we can fix the time when the final vote shall be taken.

Cries of "No. No."

DEL. GOEBEL: We have a chairman, thank you.

A DELEGATE: It seems that the intellectuals have been recognized and now they want to shut off the others.

DEL. CASSIDY: Ordinary workmen ought to have a chance to say something before this goes to a vote.

DEL. GOEBEL: All right, but let us have a time at which we shall vote.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I believe in a great deal of orthodoxy myself; I believe orthodoxy is a good thing; in seeking orthodoxy we shall meet a great many temptations; and we shall have to be more orthodox before we are able to withstand these temptations.

I have never been so much in favor of orthodoxy as since April 5, 1910, when we carried Milwaukee. Now I am getting to be quite an orthodox member of the party myself. I will say that I am thankful to the capitalist press of Milwaukee and to the capitalist candidates that they kept flaunting international revolutionary Socialism, the red flag, the ballot-bullet speech, the red flag blood lust before the eyes of the voters, so that those who voted for us in spite of it all were not afraid of international revolutionary Socialism or of revolution.

However, fanaticism is only good to a certain extent. I think fanaticism is like manure. A young plant needs a lot of manure in order to keep it warm, to keep it protected and have it grow; so it is with a party; a young movement needs a lot of fanaticism to develop the necessary heat, but if you put on too much manure you kill the plant and if you have too much fanaticism you kill the party.

Now I believe in the motto of Marx that the proletarians of all countries should unite, absolutely. But he did not say, nor would he say if he lived to-day, that they should unite in Milwaukee or Chicago or New York. We unite in spirit; we fight in the same cause; but do not come together in the same place unless it is absolutely necessary.

Our party is based on the materialistic

conception of history. That is the constitution. We have no other basis. Now the fact is this, comrades, immigration from foreign countries, even European countries, did lower and does lower our standard of living. Anybody who tells you it does not is not telling the truth. It does. I have seen it with my own eyes. You have seen it with your own eyes. We know that never before was there such a great immigration of nations and peoples as we have to-day. Last year we had almost a million and a half of men, women and children coming over to the shores of this country. But these people are of our own makeup; absolutely the same. I was one of them some years ago. But I have lived in America thirty-two years; in Milwaukee a little longer; but I came imbued not only with Socialism but also with the right kind of Americanism. The collective idea is to ask for the greatest good for the greatest mass, which is the working class. That is the only right kind of patriotism to-day, the patriotism of the working class; I know of no other.

Now I say that anybody who tells you that this immigration did not lower the standard of living is not telling the truth. I have watched it right in my own town. Comrade Hunter told you of the change in the working men in Pittsburg. Now you can see the same thing in Milwaukee among the tanners. When I came there the workers were all Americans, German-Americans and Irishmen. By and by they were all Poles, because they worked cheaper. Now these Americans and German-Americans would get eighteen to twenty dollars a week. The Poles were cheaper. Then by and by they got Italians and they were still cheaper. Then they had mostly Greeks, and now they are beginning to replace the Greeks with Syrians, and if you give them the chance to import coolies, they will work still cheaper, probably for five or six dollars a week. Now the Italians, the Poles, the Germans, the Bohemians, they all have a share in our civilization and even if you cannot reach those immigrants in the first generation you surely reach the second generation. I can tell you, comrades, something that you do not know. The Socialist movement in Milwaukee is, to begin with, more proletarian, more a working class movement, than the Socialist movement in any other part of the United States, bar

none. It is built up mainly from the trades unions of Milwaukee. Secondly, the Socialist movement of Milwaukee is more native born than any other that I know of. You see, the first generation we could not reach. The first generation of Germans went according to their religion. When they were Lutherans they were Republicans; when they were Catholics they were Democrats. We could not reach them. It was the second generation that we reached. It was the same with the Poles. We reached them through the second generation, born here; those that have gone to the public schools, those that we could reach with the right kind of literature, we reached; and our party in Milwaukee is an American party.

Now, comrades, on this question we cannot be guided by Europe; we should be foolish to be guided by Europe. The European leaders told me so when I went to Europe last fall and discussed this question with them. I will say I did not convince Kautsky. Most of the others agreed with me. You see, there is not a country of Europe that was ever in the position we are in. The nations of Europe emigrate; while the English speaking countries of America and Australia are the only countries that have immigration. We are in an entirely different position and it is very easy for those leaders to tell us you must stick to Karl Marx's idea of the proletarians of all countries uniting. But about fifteen years ago when there was a threat in Germany to import coolie laborers there was a storm in the German Social Democracy. They threatened a general strike and many other things. When the thing came home to them and they threatened to import coolies to Germany that was a different story. But some of them are willing that we should have the coolies. It is easy to stick to nice phrases when the issue does not concern you directly. It is the same thing to some extent with my friend McAllister, from Missouri. He is not afraid the coolies will come down to the farms there, but we in the cities are in a different position. Our trades unions would be up against it right away. Now, comrades, so far as our party is concerned it has never been in so favorable a condition in relation to the trades union movement as to-day. To my great surprise our victory in Milwaukee was heralded through the country as a trades union

victory. Even my own particular enemy, Sam Gompers, whom I have been fighting for twenty-five years, says: "Now, you capitalists, see what you have done. The workmen will even vote for Socialists if you don't give in." That was about as far as he went. But the trades union papers throughout the country have heralded the Milwaukee victory as a trades union victory.

And now, are we to answer them by telling them that we Socialists after winning our first great victory want to admit the Chinese, want to admit the Japanese, that we stand for Corean labor? Is this the way we want to answer them? And at the same time we pretend to be the only real labor party. We are the labor party. We are always the labor party. We are the party of the workingman, only we don't want to stand for the things that will help them. Is that the idea? How ridiculous.

Now, I don't agree with my friend Hillquit this time; in most cases I do. Now, in the first place I do not believe in hiding behind an evasion. I believe with Ferdinand Lasalle that in great things it is a mistake to be sly. I was never sly in my life. Are you going to hide behind contract labor on this question? We do not mean contract labor. We know that the Chinese coolie laborer is just as dangerous whether he comes in with a contract or without. That is hiding behind a phrase. That is trying to hide behind a phrase and be a good fellow. Isn't that your idea?

DEL. HILLQUIT: No.

DEL. BERGER: I say let us meet this great question in a great way, in an open way. If you believe in the free immigration of the Chinese let us take that stand and say: Let them in; we want them in. Let us say it openly, but I will tell you this; I won't be satisfied with that, I will fight like a tiger. And I will keep on fighting until there is this change made. I have been defeated many times in these conventions. I have been licked many times in these conventions of the Socialist party; I have been licked in Milwaukee; in the Milwaukee Federation of Labor; but remember, every dog has his day. (Great laughter.)

I will say this; this is a question of civilization mainly. I believe that our civilization, the European or Caucasian or whatever name you choose to call it, I believe that our civilization is in

question. Now I do not say that our civilization is higher. May be the Chinese civilization is higher. I don't know. But I will say this; we have a different standard of living. The Chinaman and the Hindu when they come into California as wageworkers work for a dollar or for fifty cents a day; and within ten years they are owning a whole lot of property. He will not become a wage worker of the better class or a union man; he will become a proprietor. You simply create a new yellow middle class. That is what you are doing. That has been proven over and over again in Washington, in Oregon and in California.

Now that may be higher civilization. Some say that is the simple life; some say that it shows a man is of a higher type if he can live on fifty cents a day. However, I admit that I do not believe in the simple life. I admit that I would rather live on five dollars a day than on fifty cents a day. If anybody wants us to come to the fifty cents a day basis I will fight like a tiger; I will fight and I hope every one of you will fight; it is a question of civilization.

Now we get about a million immigrants from Europe every year and we can digest them very nicely. This country has digested me pretty well. We have digested Comrade Hillquit; we have digested Comrade Morgan very nicely. We are all of the same type; of the same sort of thinking. We may fight occasionally, but after all our mode of thinking is very much the same. But, comrades, it is entirely different with these other races. They have their own history of about fifty thousand years. That cannot be undone in a generation or in two generations, or in three generations. Now there are about five hundred million Chinamen. They can send us about five million a year and not feel it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

By consent of the Congress the time of the speaker was extended.

DEL. BERGER: Now, I say that if five million a year come in, why, in about fifteen years we shall be wiped out by sheer numbers, wiped out by sheer economic forces, by the forces of economic evolution. Now, I will fight for my wife and my children; I will fight for my neighbor's wife and children; I will fight for all your wives

and children and against this immigration.

Now I am free to say that the leaders of international Socialism in Europe have agreed with me on this proposition. We have the black race problem with us now. We don't want any additional race problems. We have troubles enough already.

Spargo says this problem is insignificant now. That is so. The Chinese are kept out. That is why. They are kept out now by law. Within a year or two, however, that treaty has to be renewed or the Chinese will come in. We have to take a stand now.

Now I don't want to take any more of your time. I can see you all want to be heard on this question and I won't stand in your way; but I will add this: we want to solve this great social question; we can only help to solve it by giving ourselves a chance in this country. We want to help the Chinese and the Japanese and everybody else as much as we can, but if they come in here they will prevent us getting Socialism for the next ten thousand years and then we would not get it. It would be a new yellow race that would get it and our descendants would never have a chance to get Socialism.

Comrades, if you really believe in Socialism, if you really believe in your party, in the mission of this party, vote for the majority report.

(At this point it was decided by the congress that all those who desired to address the congress on the immigration question should hand in their names to the Chairman, who would then recognize them in order.)

DEL. KILLINGBECK (N. J.): I move that the time for speeches be cut to ten minutes, and that the rules be suspended for the purpose of putting that motion.

Motion lost.

DEL. CORY (Wash.): I want to make a few plain statements here. I am not going to take up your time with great oratory as some of the speakers have done. I want to call your attention to one fact: this day has been taken up by speakers from all over the Atlantic coast, and not one speaker from the Pacific coast, which is the section most affected at present, has been heard from yet.

I am from the Pacific coast. I am one of the proletarians affected by this yellow peril, and want to say

that you who are from the Middle and Atlantic states cannot enter into our feelings; you cannot enter into the conditions that control our life, and it is only fair that you hear the expressions of the people from the Pacific coast. While you with your idealistic theories of what the Chinaman or the Jap may be accept him as one of the brotherhood of mankind I will concede nothing of the kind. I will say that I understand the conditions that you are working under, I understand your mistaken ideas. Now, why not give some of this time to the people who can explain this thing to you?

In the first place, these people are coming into our Pacific country in great numbers. If we did as the British government did up in British Columbia, load these people on the vessels that brought them and send them back to the country from which they came, then we no longer would have this peril to contend with.

In the next place, the canneries, the great canneries of the world are located on our shores, and those canneries that were formerly operated by white men and women are now operated exclusively by Japanese and Chinese laborers. You can see all around those premises the signs: "No smoking allowed on these premises." But go inside where the fish you are so fond of eating are placed in the cans, and see who are handling the fish. There you will find the dirtiest of all dirty Chinese cutting up the fish with automatic machines. They have to be put into the cans by hand. And many of those men will cut off a piece of opium and do what we call "Hitting the pipe"—smoke the opium during the time they are packing the fish for you to eat. That is displacing the white proletarian of our coast with the coolie labor of China and Japan. It is not merely that they are orientals; it is the further fact that the very lowest are sent to our shores. You here in Chicago, this great beautiful city, what do you see? You see the student who has come here for the purpose of acquiring knowledge and an education. You don't see the class we see unless you go down to the Chinese quarter, and find the laundrymen or something of that sort. You see more of the Chinaman and the Jap who has a little money and invests that money in some business. You don't see the low class by which we are affected. You can

only judge from the standpoint of the men that you see; from the standpoint of the student. You can't understand the other class. A lady told me in this hall, and I believe that she is conscientious, and that the statement came from the heart, that she would just as soon one of her daughters would marry a Jap or a Chinaman that she had seen here in the college as any white man on earth. Do you realize, my comrades, what that means? That these men who are here in your colleges who have the traditions of the centuries back of them, the religion and the thought and the life of centuries and that they are true to those religions and traditions of their country although they are the students in your colleges—can you realize what it would mean if the blood of the orient were injected into the Caucasian blood of our country?

It is a race of people that we are discussing; and that we wish to exclude from our shores. We have reasons for so doing. The Hindoo, the Jap, the Chinese, the Corean, they are all of a race separate and distinct from ours. If that is not what we are discussing, then pray tell me what we are discussing?

I object most strenuously to this class of labor being allowed to come into the United States. I have many reasons that I have neither the time nor the inclination to discuss. But I would emphatically endorse the majority report for the exclusion of this class of people. And as one of the representatives of Washington I have to say that we come here with positive instructions to vote for such a measure and we intend to do it.

DEL KENNEDY (Pa.): How many of us wear this little red button that says, "Workers of the world, unite"? Many a time have I closed a soap box oration with those words. If the majority report is adopted we must certainly revise that. It must be, workers of Japan, unite; workers of Ireland, unite; it can't be workers of the world, unite. It is strange to me to be at variance with my teachers. I have learned a great deal of revolutionary doctrine right out of Comrade Untermann's books; Wanhope is another one who has helped me along; and it rather surprises me to find myself at variance with him. There are others too. But if there is any one in this room that has felt the pressure of

competition from foreign labor it is myself. I have seen myself and my old shop mates and my school mates crowded out of a job one after the other, by foreign labor. So I cannot be charged with indifference or lack of knowledge. The delegate from Washington thinks because she is in the midst of Chinese and Japanese that that is the only problem. We in Pennsylvania have a far bigger problem than that. We have more foreign immigrants, ten to one, in Pennsylvania than they have. Most of the American workingmen holler against the foreigners, and one of the hardest questions I have had to face has been when working men would come to me and say: How about the foreigners? I have tried to explain our position. I have always had to go into a long explanation of why the foreigner came over here to oppress us. There are two great classes of forces that cause this immigration: the natural and the artificial. You have heard from one of the speakers about the seven thousand agents in Italy. They are artificial forces at work. But there are natural forces at work too. You have heard about our two billions of exports. That is, the two billions of commodities sent to the rest of the world that we American wage slaves don't get wages enough to buy back after we have produced them. The average wage of the European worker is said to be three hundred dollars; the wage of the Asiatic is less. Divide two billions by three hundred and see what you get. That is one of the forces that are driving the foreigner over here. If you are making stoves in Chicago and the fellows who have been buying them go to Detroit to buy them, what are you going to do, sit down and die? No; you are going to Detroit and compete with the fellows there. So if we are going to exclude any class of immigrants from any place in the world we should also go on record as favoring compelling the American capitalist to keep American products in America.

The assertion has been made that the Asiatics coming to this country are convicts. Has there been a scrap of proof of that? The man who made it refers to the Union Pacific—

DEL DE BELL: I referred to the Public Library.

DEL KENNEDY: Now he refers me to the Public Library with two mil-

lion volumes. That is the kind of assertion that we have in favor of the majority report. Outside of Comrade Untermann, the assertion has been made over and over again that we should not do anything to offend the trades unions. If we are going to calculate consequences with such nicety we better get off the job. We have gone against all kinds of prejudice all over the world and in spite of that we are making progress. There seems to be a sort of effort to sweeten our programme for the A. F. of L.

Cries of "No."

DEL KENNEDY: That is the way it looks to me. I am not in favor of doing that just when they have reached the point that they have got to come to us. I am free of prejudice on this because I have been a member of the molder's union for a long time.

One time in this State of Illinois, Stephen Douglas, when it was proposed to repudiate some bonds, was brought in from his sick bed and he said: "Let us be honest if we never pay a cent." And so I say: Let us be brave if we never win a battle. So long as the capitalist class controls the economic and political power of this country they are going to legislate to suit themselves. Our whole social and industrial mechanism depends for its smooth running on there always being present an army of idle men. We are now producing for a world market; and whether we compete with the Jap or the Chinaman or the Italian or the Slav or the Swede right here in Chicago or in the world's market it makes no difference. You drop a stone into a vessel level full and the water flows over. So it is with capitalism. They are erecting tube mills in Europe; they began in Italy two years ago and they will soon be erecting them in Japan and China and India. Already some of the watch companies are machining the parts of their watches and sending them to Japan to be assembled and they are assembled there and they leave out one or two screws so that they come in under our beautiful tariff laws as uncompleted articles, at a lower tariff rate, and then they are finished up here. That is going on in every direction.

Now, just a word on lowering the standard of living. That is impossible. The standard of living is so low down in Pennsylvania in the infernal regions

that no race on earth could possibly lower it. It is all bunk about lowering the American standard of living. That is Fourth of July talk. Comrade Haywood told me of an incident out there in a strike where after three or four months the white men were willing to compromise, but the Japs went to them and offered to support them if they would keep on fighting. I offer this in support of what Comrade Merrick told you.

A DELEGATE: I would like you to prove that.

DEL. KENNEDY: Comrade Haywood told me; go after him if it is not right. Now, if I were asked as a molder what single race gave us the most trouble I would say the French-Canadians. And we know that they have some revolutionary spirit over there. But I would not, so far as I am concerned, raise my voice against any immigrant in the world, but if I were a commanding voice that could reach the hearts of men I would whisper to them the message that Mary Ellen Lease used to whisper in the old days: "Raisc lcss corn and more hell." And they took her advice to some extent; and they sent Billy Bryan and Sockless Jerry Simpson and Whiskers Peffer and some others down to Washington, with the result of securing the Interstate Commerce laws and such other immediate demand laws. How much more time have I got?

THE CHAIRMAN: Just enough to raise hell.

DEL. KENNEDY: If I had such a commanding voice I would send this message to the workers of the world: You Irishman, you Englishman, you Scotchman, you Hungarian, you Chinaman, you Jap, don't come to America, where they will crush you in their quarries, grind you on their railroads, and blow you up in their mines, and then say you were never there at all; don't come to America; stay where you are, and do less work and raise more hell.

A motion was made and seconded that the list of speakers be closed at this time. Carried by 47 ayes and 16 noes.

DEL. BREWER (Kans.): When I heard the majority and the minority reports read I wondered why we had this hall decorated with the red flag, and why it was that as a soap boxer I had always been proud of the fact that

this was an international movement of the working class of the world and why it was we had a red flag which stood for human brotherhood regardless of creed, color or nationality. I wondered if I was ready to exclude one-quarter of the population of the world from this movement. If I was I could never again say that the red flag stood for human brotherhood. And I could not express myself with such freedom and enthusiasm as I have been accustomed to do since I became a Socialist. Now, after listening to the minority report, I felt that it lacked something and I was very glad when I heard Comrade Hillquit's substitute, but when I heard the amendment of Comrade Lee I saw the majority report in a little different form, that is all.

I am in favor of Comrade Hillquit's substitute. The majority report with the appendix attached by Comrade Lee indicates simply an echo of the attitude of the A. F. of L. I will ask if the majority of this congress have taken this matter so seriously for any other reason? Are we not quite likely to take ourselves too seriously anyhow? We can meet here and resolve that we will exclude the Asiatics, but so long as we have capitalism and so long as capitalism wants the Asiatics in America we will have those Asiatics here until we get possession of all the powers of government. Capitalism makes the laws that guide us. Capitalism makes the laws that we are compelled to live under. We as a working class do not have any voice in the laws that are made. They will make exclusion laws effective when they want them and not until they do.

Now, it seems to me that Comrade Hillquit's substitute states our position as being opposed to contract labor, and various other things that we are all opposed to, and that it is absolutely impossible to take a definite position one way or the other at this time. I would like for the benefit of the delegates before the discussion goes much further to have the substitute of Delegate Hillquit read again.

The substitute offered by Del. Hillquit and the amendment offered by Del. Lee were then read by Del. Strobel.

DEL. ATWOOD (S. D.): Before we vote on that I have some instructions from the farmers of South Dakota that I want to deliver; and if it

were not for that I would not waste your time, and as it is I shall talk very briefly.

We farmers of South Dakota have leisure in the winter and when we knew this subject was coming up we discussed it and I don't think there has been a single thought offered in this congress today that I have not heard already out on the Dakota prairies. Consequently, you have not changed my mind.

When you talk about blanket stiffs, I have been a blanket stiff. It has nothing to do with this subject. When you tell me that a Chinaman is unsanitary, I say that I admit that a white man when he has his feet washed smells sweeter than a Chinaman. But I do not think that has anything to do with this subject. You may tell me that it is a peculiar situation; that it demands a statutory enactment. But tell me, can you set aside an economic law by statute? Can you? Tell me. Now, I am going to read the rest of it. I want to be careful. Capitalism is international and world-wide. The oriental exists in the same world. Whenever the capitalist desires to bring his business and the most profitable labor together the very international character of capitalism will enable him to accomplish his end, and unless frustrated by international Socialism, also world-wide, the standard of living will be further inevitably lowered.

The hope that intelligent unionists can be fooled into endorsing Socialism by being deluded by this futile exclusion of orientals can only fade into nothingness when subjected to analysis. On the contrary, when we cast aside principle for votes they will turn from us with the contempt we deserve. There can never be a purely national stand taken consistently against the international foe, capitalism. And I consider if we do this thing the International Congress would be justified in excluding our delegates as tending to lower the standard of Socialism and international solidarity.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): There is one feature of this debate which has struck me very forcibly. In the convention of two years ago there were a number of so-called immediate demands adopted, each one of which was warranted to produce so many thousand votes from among the workers. We who protested against the introduction of immediate demands into

our platform were told to look toward Europe and see what the Socialists were doing there. If it was done in Germany then it was right and could not be wrong. We were told that everything they did at the Socialist Congress on the other side was right. And we must do likewise. And here today we are told that these infallible authorities in Europe don't know anything on this immigration question. We must not pay attention to them, because if we do we are liable to lose the few votes we now have in the reactionary American Federation of Labor.

In that same campaign two years ago we were told not to take a stand for industrial unionism because it would hurt the feelings of Sam Gompers, John Mitchell and some others. What was the result. At the height of the campaign when the Socialists were taking up the collection to run the Red Special through the country, right when we were making splendid progress, out comes the organ of the American Federation of Labor edited by Gompers, and sneeringly asked who paid for the Red Special. Now you ask the Socialist Party to further humiliate itself by doing this thing to avoid injuring the feelings of the American Federation of Labor. You do not advance Socialism nor do you advance the time when you can win an election in this country.

We are further told that without exclusion of the orientals you are going to lower the standard of living. It has been pointed out that in parts of the country where they have no oriental problem they have lowered the standard of living. Comrade Berger brought this discussion to Milwaukee. I want to call the attention of the Milwaukee comrades to conditions there which they have made no effort yet to better. The average Japanese will not work for less than twenty-five cents an hour. The Chinese will not work for less than a dollar a day. Now, take those poor devils up in Milwaukee; that is the first step in your damnable white slave traffic. Those girls up there are working for three dollars a week in the most unsanitary conditions, and you don't find any Japanese, Chinese, Hindoo or Corean in Milwaukee lowering the standard of living for those girls. They would not accept such wages to start with. Another feature of this debate that has

impressed me. The opponents of the minority report have asked for facts. But they have not given any. We have been told what the comrades in California would do; and what the comrades in New York have done with the labor unions, and I want to point out that in California you have ten per cent of the state vote, and in New York you have five per cent of the total vote of the state, and I want to point out also that where we have tried to keep the Socialist propaganda above reproach, above the suggestion of immediate demands, we have got a higher vote, a higher per cent of the total vote, than in sections where they have trailed after every conceivable immediate demand that they thought would advance their position. I refer to Idaho, and Arizona, and Washington and Oregon, and other places where we have done the best we could to prevent the introduction into our platforms of things that did not concern Socialists or Socialism.

Comrade Hunter gave us a lot of facts here today. I do not dispute his facts. But the conditions he referred to are the results of European immigration and not of oriental immigration. Now if you want to better the standard of living and stop immigration, don't come here with a resolution and say it is specific races we want to keep out, but come here with a resolution and be men and say you are opposed to all immigration. And then you are going back to the Know Nothing position. We are here today because the conditions in Europe did not suit our forbears, who tried to get out of them to better themselves. And are we today to say to the people in Europe and China and Japan who want to better their position also: You must not come here? We have bettered ourselves, but you must not; stay where you are.

One other point. The minority report stands for the Stuttgart resolution. That is the resolution passed by the International Congress of the Socialist Party held at Stuttgart. That resolution declared against the Socialist Party of any of the nations declaring in favor of absolute exclusion. It does provide, however, that you have the right to declare against stimulated immigration. You have a right to declare against immigration stimulated for the purpose of breaking strikes or for the purpose of creating a problem

in employment. And that this minority report also declares against. I am going to call the free and voluntary going from one country to another immigration, and the other I am going to call importation. I am in favor of the immigration of any Chinese, Japanese or Hindoos, and I abhor and condemn most severely the importation of any race for the purposes that are mentioned in this minority report.

That is the position that sooner or later this Socialist Party will have to take. We are going to be driven to it by the force of circumstances. Five or six years ago there was some labor trouble in a certain portion of California; Japanese and Mexicans were involved. The Japanese and Mexicans each of them separately sent in applications for a Federation of Labor charter. And that august body to which this revolutionary Socialist Party must kowtow, sent word to the Japanese, "We can't grant you a charter because of your race and color," and they sent word to the Mexicans, "We are sending charter by return mail." The Mexicans heard that the charter had been refused to the Japs and they sent word to Washington: "We don't want your charter, until you give it to Japanese as well."

We have labor trouble down in Arizona. It is one of the most difficult I have come across. We have the Mexican peon escaping across the line. Am I going to send him back across the line? No; I am going to try to lift him as high as I am myself and perhaps higher. The Mexican peon is a convict. So was Jesus Christ; so was Eugene V. Debs.

A DELEGATE: There is a distinction there.

DEL. CANNON: The Chinese coolie has just as much right as the white coolie. There are lots of us white coolies here. Those poor devils are arrested and fined ten or twenty dollars, and then he is put to work it out. Then he is charged just as much as his wages; and the result is that he is held in bondage. When he gets an opportunity to escape across that imaginary line, I am going to say: "Come on in and do the best you can." And that fellow will come and work for less wages than I will. That is human nature. Still we do not say: "You have got to be a slave for the rest of your natural life, but we let

him in and then we try to organize those peons.

DEL. CASSIDY (N. Y.): This is my first experience of a Socialist Congress, and after listening to the floods of oratory here it is rather presumptuous of me to address an audience of this character. We have listened to men who have written volumes on Socialism and the class struggle, and it seems presumptuous for an ordinary workingman to gainsay any of the statements made by these intellectual giants, such as Comrades Wanhope, Berger, Untermann, Hunter, and so forth. But I am in that position though.

In sizing up this audience I have come to the conclusion that the delegates are of a different brand of Socialism from what I have figured myself out to be. They all seem to be timid political Socialists. It seems to me there is something of the trimmer about the gathering because after a resolution is brought in and then a minority report is presented we have one of our intellectual attorneys get up and offer a straddle proposition and then to further befuddle matters along comes our celebrated editor from New York, Comrade Lee, and performs a feat of verbal legerdemain and strings it out so long that we forget the fore part of his resolution before we hear the end of it. His resolution, if I can understand English words, is an approval of the majority report. Unless I am a fool, that is the sense of Comrade Lee's appendage.

Let us be honest with ourselves. Let us stand up like men and face this issue. I am in favor of the minority report here and don't think there is a word that should be scratched out. There may be some sentiment in that report, as has been said here, but I can see nothing in it in conflict with the Stuttgart resolution or in conflict with international Socialism.

There is one other thing that we need to do. We are posing as the champions of the working class. But you are kowtowing to the American Federation of Labor. And as Socialists you know, if you know anything, that the labor unions of America are a gigantic farce; the laughing stock of the world. Why must we crawl on our bellies to Sam Gompers? Remember that I am at this moment a member of the American Federation of Labor. I have a right to criticise it.

But my brand of Socialism is this, that before we can have any industrial democracy we must have an economic organization that will back up our ballots when they are cast. We are mere trimmers. You may call yourselves opportunists, you may call me an impossibilist; I don't care what you call me; the fact is here nevertheless that an economic organization must blaze the way; it must be the vanguard; it must be the organization that will fight when those ballots are cast. Before the industrial commonwealth can be ushered in you must have an industrial organization.

DEL. AMERINGER (Okla.): We have talked on this for two solid days, and I believe the delegates are ready to vote. It is only a minor matter.

It was moved and seconded that the hour of adjournment be fixed at 7 o'clock. Carried.

It was moved and seconded that the roll call be taken on the immigration question at 6:50 p. m. The motion was lost by a vote of 44 ayes and 37 noes, not being the two-thirds required to suspend the rules.

Delegate Morgan moved that the hour of closing the debate be fixed for 12 noon of the next session. Declared out of order.

Delegate Hillquit moved that the time of the authors of the different propositions before the house be limited to five minutes each. Delegate Lee seconded the motion. The motion was lost.

DEL. LONDON of the Jewish Section: As a delegate representing a foreign speaking national organization, I desire to say that I participated in the formation of the first branch of the Social Democracy of America, and I had the honor of being a delegate to the national convention of the Social Democratic Party ten years ago.

Now, coming down to the point, the majority report is extremely unsatisfactory. Its main defect is that it is dishonest. Comrade Berger, Comrade Untermann, and Comrade Wanhope have not done their duty towards the Socialist Party and towards this Congress. They were appointed two years ago to study the question of immigration and to prepare data and facts from which we could learn something. They have come here with a meaningless resolution. That is the result of two years' work of three great and learned men, the statesmen of Milwau-

kee, the scientific mind of the Pacific Coast, and the orator of the East. (Laughter.) I feel that we ought to take all the resolutions and send them back to a Resolution Committee of intelligent men, and then we can get an intelligent resolution. Now, they have not done properly; we have not had before us a proper report.

There is one fundamental point in this case, and one of the things that pained me in the discussion today was the attitude taken by two women Socialists in this matter. I expected the women to favor something in the direction of sentiment, in the direction of international brotherhood, in the direction of the greater side of Socialism, and yet they are the most practical on this proposition, the most conservative, the most orthodox, and they seem to have surrendered to race prejudice and race division.

The majority report is faulty in this: It violates a fundamental principle of Socialism, and that is why we are compelled to get down to elementary principles. You violate that law. You violate that fundamental principle of Socialism which prohibits you from discriminating against a race. (Applause.) I, as a Jew, do not feel at all complimented by those remarks that you have made. I do not need your compliments; we do not need any of your expressions. You cannot exclude us. For 2,000 years they have tried to crush us, but they could not. We are one of those races that cannot be crushed. You cannot get the Jew down any way. Now, what I object to in this resolution is that it discriminates against a race. One of the most painful things in life that I have been acquainted with is the murder of the Chinese by thugs and ruffians, and every time I saw a Jew abused by a thug or russian I was thinking of the oppression of the Armenians and Poles.

When you say we will exclude people because they are Japanese and because they are Chinese and because they are Hindoos, you violate the decalogue, one of the elementary principles of international Socialism, and you will have declared the bankruptcy of Socialism. Let us say we people are clever; let us say it may be good in Germany, the country of Marx, possibly, but it is not good enough in the country of Berger and Untermann and Wanhope. Let us say it is good enough in Italy and wherever the

human mind is in chains, but it is not good enough here. You are breaking away from the international Socialist movement before you have created a movement here. You have no Socialist movement here. What is the use of taking such an attitude? I do not see. If we had any kind of a Socialist movement on the East side, in the Ghetto, where I come from, we would have elected a Socialist Congressman. Six or eight years ago we were told: "Why send a Jewish immigrant to Congress, when the American workingmen do not send them to Congress?" That was the most effective argument used against Comrade Hillquit when he was a candidate. They said: "If you should send a Socialist to Congress, they will exclude the Jews from America and adopt a strong immigration law, and they will exclude as many races as possible."

Now then, are we prepared to break away from the international Socialist movement? Are we prepared? I do not speak only in behalf of the Jewish immigrants, because we are not concerned. There are no restrictive laws against us. There cannot be and there will not be any, and I do not fear any. But I do speak in behalf of all the oppressed races, and I say that by adopting a resolution pointing to particular races they will point the finger of scorn at you and they will say that the Socialists of America have put upon the great mass of Japanese and Chinese the stamp of inferiority. That is your own act, and it is not in accordance with the principles of the international movement, or even the ordinary principles of fair dealing and honesty or the principles of Americanism, as far as I understand them. (Applause.) You want to turn America back; you claim to be progressive; you are taking a step backward. Do not be such little politicians, in Heaven's name. I would like to see the Milwaukee comrades sent to Congress. I would like to hear such a humorous, clever speech as that of Comrade Berger here delivered in Congress, but I would not like to sacrifice one of the fundamental, elementary principles of our faith, that part of our faith which makes Socialism worth fighting for. And yet here in America, in the particular country where immigrants have come and created a new nation, a nation which has gathered within itself all the energetic and progressive ele-

ments of the entire world, you propose to say to the international Socialistic world that you will adopt race distinctions in our Socialist Congresses. I therefore recommend that the resolution of Comrade Hillquit, which is in consonance with the resolution of the International Socialist Congress, be adopted as the voice and sentiment of the National Congress of the Socialist Party. (Applause.)

At the usual adjourning hour, a motion was carried to extend the time of adjournment to seven o'clock.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): I will say that I will not use fifteen minutes, but I believe we have overlooked, in trying to throw criticism on personalities, some of the fundamental principles that underlie this question. I want to say that from my training as a Socialist I believe that I am with the minority. I do not know yet how I am going to vote exactly. I believe I am with the minority. From my Socialist training and from reading our writers I would be on the side of the majority. That does not change the fact, although my training may have led me that way and that one of the strongest arguments that has been made here has been most in favor of the majority, namely, that these men who have given their time to this question are advocating the position that they are. But I want to come right down to the economic reason in support of my argument. The whole human race, as stated awhile ago, can be put in the State of Texas and give them one-eighth of an acre apiece. It is not a question of territory, but it is a question as to whether it would be proper to put the whole human race in the State of Texas or not. There is a grave question. Prior to the present time my economic training has trained me to the viewpoint that the oriental, if you please, was a worse enemy of the American laborer on his own soil than he will be on American soil, bad as he will be on American soil. That has been my training and that has been my belief, that he is our worst enemy over there. Used in the capitalists' hands he is no greater enemy than the black race is. I want to say that we have had some mis-statements on both sides. They tell me you cannot do anything with the black race or the orientals. I don't believe it. I can go into an audience of 500 people, black and white, and I can get

a bigger percentage of converts to Socialism among the black men than among the white men. I have been there and I know it is true. I think there has been some misrepresentations on both sides. The question that comes to us is this: I do not believe it is a violation of an international principle if we favor exclusion if it is necessary. But I want to say to my German friends, if we were menacing them and they said: "Here, we advise you to stay there and fight it out there; it will make it worse here"; if my German comrades would say that, I believe I could with generosity say that "I believe perhaps you understand the conditions there best, and I will try and stay here and make the best fight I can." I believe it would be my duty to say so, and I believe, as one of the comrades has said, that Socialists everywhere will look at it that way. Now, the next question comes, can we get the idea to the workers not to come here? I do not believe you can. Capitalism is today sweeping the world everywhere together; everywhere, mind you. In Colorado we have many Japs in the district I come from. They are today the dominant farm help. I believe the Russians have quit northern Colorado, but I can see little difference in the two. Capitalism is using them both as a disorganizing force in fighting the American worker, and I do not see that it would help them any to land them back in their own country, where capitalism will use them and then dump their products on American soil, to compete with American labor. There is where the real competition is.

However, coming back to the viewpoint that we could all live in the less than one-eighth of an acre apiece State of Texas, and that men live on on this earth. Families live on less than half an acre in many parts of the world, and if Texas was tapped by the Rocky Mountain water system you could water the whole of Texas. However, I do not believe it would be expedient to try to put the whole human race in Texas.

The question sums itself up to this one point, in my mind, and with such guidance as I have in casting a vote on this question, I hope you will give me the right to vote on it as a question of expediency and advancement, not only of the American Socialist Party, but international Socialism; and

if the passing of a resolution denouncing the importation of labor of all kinds would favor Socialism in general, and I believed it would augment and help the cause of Socialism, I would do it. The whole thing sums up in this. I do not know how I will come to my decision unless I look at it as a question of policy as to whether the Chinaman will hurt us worse in his own country than he will in this country. If he will break us down worse in his own country, then they will keep him there. If the German will break us down worse in this country than he will in Germany, then the German Socialist will say amen if we pass an anti-immigration resolution in this conference. If the Germans of Germany can help us by coming here, and if the Chinaman of China can help us by coming here, then Socialists will say amen if we pass the minority resolution. For myself, I will not say at the present moment of the debate that I am in favor of Comrade Hillquit's resolution, and I do not believe, as Comrade Berger stated, that this is a straddle of the position at all, because if it is, the International resolution is a straddle position. I take exception to my comrades here who will not agree with any of you, and I want to say with Comrade Berger that I have never yet voted for a man who was elected to a public office, so that I am at home if I am at odds with all of you; I am not lost.

The one question I want to reiterate, and then I will leave the floor, is, will this help the Socialist movement more to adopt the minority or the majority report? That must decide the question, and when we have decided it, I have one more plea to put up to this congress. I do not care which way it goes. This is a question of policy. The ultimate end is Socialism, and I ask each and every one of you, when the majority has decided this question, until we come together again let us go away from here with the determination that we stand with the majority to fight for Socialism and for the establishment of the principles of our grand leader, Marx, in every corner of the globe, China as well as America.

DEL. WOLFF (Jewish Agitation Bureau): I will try to state as briefly as possible my position in the matter, and I will try as much as possible to stick to the subject that is before us. I am in favor of the substitute offered

by Comrade Hillquit, for the following reasons: The questions that are before us just at the present time are the majority report that says exclude Asiatics because they injure the labor organizations in the United States, and because they help to reduce the standard of living of the workers in the United States. The further question that is before us is the minority report, which says exclude them if they do that which the majority report claims they do. A further matter that is before us is Comrade Hillquit's substitute, which says that we are against excluding anybody because of race, nationality, color, religion, or anything else of that sort, but we are against permitting the capitalist class to import strike breakers by mass foreign immigration for the specific purpose of bringing them here to specific places to injure the working class in their work of advancing the condition of the workers of the United States, and that I believe to be the correct position to take, because it conforms to the resolution adopted by the International Socialist Congress, and which we are to obey.

Second, because it is the only logical position that we can take without being very inconsistent. If we take the position of the majority, it follows very naturally that all those immigrants who injure the standard of living of the American workers, that all those immigrants who make it more difficult to organize the workers in the United States, ought to be excluded. And I maintain that not one shred of evidence has been submitted here from any of the comrades who spoke for the majority report to prove that Asiatic immigration is more harmful to the workers of the United States than immigration from any other section of the world. I maintain that it has not been proven here at all that Asiatic immigration as such is more harmful than Jewish, Italian, Belgian, or any other immigration that has come from other parts of the world to this country. We cannot, therefore, exclude them because of those reasons; we cannot, therefore, argue that we are excluding them because they injure the working class of the United States. We must immediately perceive that the argument is only superficial, and that we are actually excluding them because of race prejudice. (Applause.) For, remember, comrades, the Asiatics

are said to injure the workers in America. It is admitted by all those who have had a chance to observe the working effects of immigration upon the United States and its people, that all immigrants temporarily injure the workers of America. The reporter of the minority has admitted that he, an Englishman, worked here below the regular rate of wages while he was an immigrant. It has been admitted by Comrade Untermann that he, being a European immigrant from Germany, worked for less than the regular rate of wages while he was an immigrant in this country. Consequently, it has not been proven at all that the Asiatics are the greater menace economically to the organized workers of the United States than are the Germans, Finns, Italians, Jews, or the peoples from all other parts of the world. We can, therefore, only exclude them, if we do, on the line of race or nationality. That we must not do, for I believe the comrades that are here do not desire to adopt a certain resolution that will go before the workers of the United States as being our position on immigration, when it is not what we intend to do.

The minority report is unsatisfactory because it says we ought to do this thing if it is true, and it does not give us any clear statement of whether it is true or not. It merely assumes that if this is true we ought to do it, which is just as bad.

Comrade Hillquit's substitute goes to the root of the matter. It says we are against excluding any races of people, but we are for protecting the working class of the United States to the extent of our ability against foreign importation of strike breakers, against mass immigration for the capitalist class, for the specific purpose of lowering the standard of living of the workers in the United States. If we go before the people of this country, the workers of this country, with such a position as that, we are standing where we can expect their sympathy and support, and we are standing where we can expect the sympathy and support of all the aliens in the country. If we are afraid of losing the support of the unions, if we are afraid of losing the support of the organized workers in the United States, let me tell you, comrades, we ought to be just as much afraid of losing the sympathy and support of

the aliens in the United States. Let me tell you that a large portion of the organized workers of the United States are but recent immigrants. Let me tell you that in the large cities of the United States, as in New York, we have about fifty per cent of aliens who would vote for the Socialist Party if we were to adopt such a resolution. (Applause.) Let me tell you that two years ago, when Comrade Hillquit was a candidate for Congress in New York City, the question that was raised against him was the suspicion that he might be against a certain kind of immigration or race or nationality which might ultimately be extended to races from other parts of the world except Jews. Comrade Hillquit need not be accused now of being interested in the matter. He is not now a candidate for Congress of the Socialist Party in New York, but his position is better than it was two years ago, and to that extent I am glad to support him because it shows an improvement upon what he thought two years ago. He seems to have learned upon that matter. The Socialist Party of the United States two years ago recognized the foreign speaking organizations for the purpose of facilitating the organizing of those workers in the Socialist movement. The foreign speaking organizers who know the temper of the foreign speaking population of the United States are a unit against the majority report, a unit against excluding Asiatics. But they are probably also a unit for the resolution offered by Comrade Hillquit. I therefore think, comrades, that both on the principle of international Socialism and on the principle of respectable politics in the better sense of the word, if you please, we ought to be able to go before the comrades, the workers of the United States, without first having to make explanations as to what we want to do with reference to races of people. Let me tell you, comrades, if we do not, we are going to come in contact with the labor union men, the American Federation of Labor and labor leaders of the American Federation of Labor, who will try to twit us on our question of immigration and will say that we have not gone far enough. It should be the privilege and the duty of Socialist representatives, either on the stump or in the halls, to teach the workers in the American Federation of Labor, and to teach the leaders in the American Fed-

eration of Labor the reason for our very proper stand on the matter, the reason why we are in conformity with the International resolution adopted in Stuttgart, the reason why we are here at the first Congress of the Socialist Party of the United States. I hope you will adopt Comrade Hillquit's substitute. (Applause.)

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I wish to speak to Comrade Hillquit's substitute, and I will try to bring the matter to a focus in a very few plain statements. The question is one of the standards of living. I know of no other question in which we as a Socialist Party at this point are interested. This is a point of tragic interest to us, of vital interest to every one of us. My standard of living is low enough now, thank you. There has been talk here of economic equality. Well, that depends. I want it if it takes me up. If economic equality takes me down, I get off the elevator at the first stop I can get off. If the capitalist elevator rings the bell down, and we are on board, we want to reduce our burdens and ring the bell to go up. That is what we are trying to do, and that is the result all of us want, I understand. I think that is what the majority and minority are trying to do. Now I do not see quite enough of it in the majority report to suit me.

The comrade who represents the Jewish comrades from New York said a true word, as I got it. I am going to add one. He said there is no American Socialist movement. That is true. I said that before. I am glad to hear him say it. One of the reasons is that the Jews do not take out naturalization papers so they can vote. (Applause.) They have very little political sense, common sense, sense that enables them to do any political work. The most effective way to ring the bell for the elevator that carries the standard of living up is to vote. It doesn't cost you near so much as it does to strike. Ain't that right? Now, the many things that are preventing our voting at the ballot box effectively and efficiently have been registered here on this floor today, in forms that are surprising. Comrades, this is a political meeting, if I understand it rightly. If this is not a meeting of a political party I will take my hat and go home. We are here to prepare for political action, intelligently and effectively, and if it

does not mean that, it does not mean anything to me here today; it is all confusion. But it does mean that to me, political action. Now, anything that puts the blanket stiff on the hog, anything that sends people into the slums, anything that puts a man out of a job, anything that lowers the standard of life, anything that reduces intelligence or prevents intelligence in America; not only that, but anything that makes political organization difficult in America, rings the bell to go down. Do you hear me? One of the things necessary for political organization is what we call in the English language homogeneity. That is to say, we must be as much alike as possible; and the more different classes and the more different nationalities and the more different kinds and habits of life and language and food and clothing and living and everything else that you introduce, the harder it is to ring the bell to go up, and the easier it is for the other fellow to ring the bell to go down. Am I right? Do we want this, as Socialists fighting on the basis of materialism? Ah, you idealists, fighting on the basis of economic determinism, you then challenge me for being an idealist, etc., etc., but you come here with a Utopian picture of a world-wide co-operative commonwealth and no hope except in world-wide Socialism. Is that all? Nothing short of that? We may be in several different heavens before that time comes. So will you, and you know it. Now then, I want to go up while I am on earth. I talked about this dream while I was still in the pulpit, but ever since I have been on the Socialist platform, I have been talking of getting more bread, better homes, better clothes here and now.

Will Asiatics help to organize your labor unions or hinder? You Russian Jews and Croatians and Bulgarians and Slavs and Greeks and Assyrians and Sicilians, will the Poles and Slovaks and East Indians and Japs and Coreans help you or hinder you to build an American Socialist Party? Tell me that.

A DELEGATE: They will help us.

DEL. GAYLORD: Help us? They don't help in Milwaukee. A mighty little, mighty little factor. No, sir. Some use, but mighty little.

A DELEGATE: Where do the votes come from?

DEL. GAYLORD: Where do the

votes come from? I went down in the Italian ward and spent the whole of election day there watching to see that those crooked Irishmen did not lead the Italians around by the nose. Victor Berger took an automobile and went from one Polish precinct to another to see to it that those same Irish politicians did not lead the Poles around by the nose.

DEL. BERGER: They couldn't.

DEL. GAYLORD: But they did to some extent in the eighteenth ward that day. By George, you can't fool me on Milwaukee. You also may have observed that it is not a Berger movement in Milwaukee alone. There are some other folks in Milwaukee. (Laughter.) No discredit to Comrade Berger. We know his value, as you also may have observed.

Now, comrades, I have said the principal thing that is to be said. Now, let me say the last thing and put the point on it all. Somebody here said that if he were a voice, a commanding voice. I used to talk that way too. You are to be a commanding voice the way you vote; you are to speak the word to the Socialist parties of the world. Delegates will be elected very soon to go to the International Congress, and they will carry to the nations of the earth, to the Socialist parties, your message, "Stay home and raise your hell where you were born. Don't come here. We have got enough hell now." Do you want to send that word? Vote for the resolution that most strongly puts on record the Socialist Party of America as saying to them, "We are hurt more than we are helped by your coming here. You don't give very much help." I do not understand why we should want to make more difficult the problem and the task of organizing the Socialist Party of America for political action and to organize the labor unions of America for industrial action. These men are difficult to organize and get to the polls because they are scattered and have no home. They have lost their stake in the country and they are getting to be desperate. But, comrades, men that are desperate and driven by hunger are not the men that have the capacity to build a new civilization. If they had, they would have been building it. The Socialist Party has called us municipal Socialists. Listen. Until the workers of America prove that they know how to take pos-

sition of and administer the municipal affairs of a few cities in America, they have got to show the rest of the country that they know enough to take possession and administer the national affairs of the country. (Applause.)

As between us, on the whole the arguments and facts presented, treatises and propaganda documents are best contained in the majority report. For clearness of statement, if I had to take a choice between Comrade Hillquit's substitute and the minority report, Comrade Hillquit's substitute is better. The minority report—well, the less said about it the better. Let us forget it. Comrades, do not forget this: This is a political party, and when we do not prove our reason for existence as a political party, organized to secure political power, we lose the reason why people should vote our ticket to save themselves from beggary and hunger and their children from ignorance, degradation and degeneracy. (Applause.)

DEL. GERMER (Ill.): If we could usher in the co-operative commonwealth by beautiful phrases, glittering generalities, Latin maxims, it would have been done years ago. Soaring high into the clouds and the skies is not solidifying the working class of the world. We will have to get out of the clouds and the skies and get down to terra firma, come down to practical propositions. Comrade McAllister, who comes from my sister state of Missouri, lives on the Ozark Mountains, is surrounded by beautiful scenery, and it is very easy for him in his own imagination to draw beautiful pictures. The Ozark Mountains are an inspiration for pictures, but pictures do not bring the working class together and do not cause the working class to think of their immediate economic interests.

I am in favor of the substitute offered by Comrade Hillquit. I know something about alien labor and its effect upon the condition of the working men and its effect upon labor organizations. Comrade Spargo says, let us tell these people to come into our unions; let us solidify them and let us then protect our interests. I believe that their organization has spent half a million dollars asking the miners of Alabama to come into the miners' union, but we could not persuade Governor Comer to our way of thinking. Telling the working men to come into

the labor organizations does not bring them in. They asked the miners of Colorado to come into an economic organization and solidify, but Governor Peabody would not agree to it. We spent thousands—yes, we have spent millions of dollars in the State of West Virginia. This may sound rash, but it is a fact. The United Mine Workers have spent approximately two million dollars organizing, or attempting to organize, the miners of West Virginia, and out of 60,000 of them in the state we have probably 1,200 or less in the organization. So appealing to them to come into the organization is not going to bring them in. And what are they? What are the miners in Alabama? Mostly colored. What are the miners of West Virginia? Mostly foreigners. They are the recruiting station for the mining field in the balance of the country.

Comrade Kaplan refers us to a religious meeting that was held here, attended by Japs, Chinese and Hindoos, and he inferred that because they attended that meeting is a logical reason why you should adopt the minority report. Let the Hindoos and the Japs or any one else attend religious meetings. We have nothing to do with that. We are attending a Socialist Congress in the interest of the working class.

Comrade Hunter brought out one very important point when he referred to the tactics employed by Armour & Company by keeping on hand twice the number of employees necessary to carry on the business. That is what they are doing in every industry in the country, and it is in the interest of the capitalist employers to get in just as much alien labor as they possibly can and hold it up before the face of the man who is organized and tell him, "If you don't like your condition, if you don't like your wage, why don't you quit?" If he quits, this other fellow that is there and is mighty well trained will come into the industry and take his place.

I do not agree with Comrade Cannon when he refers to Sam Gompers and gives him credit for being the entire American Federation of Labor. I am affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I do not agree with its policies or its principles, and Sam Gompers is not the entire American Federation of Labor, and neither are

Sam Gompers and John Mitchell, combined.

One comrade gets up and says we are the fighters. I want to say this in connection with who are the fighters; it may be said here that in the various industries where the foreigners are employed to a certain extent, the steel industry, the mining industry and a few others, that the foreigners have been the fighters. I agree with you to a certain measure that that is true, but the fight they have been putting up, the protest they have been registering, has been an ignorant one and not an intelligent protest. What have we in Illinois right now in the mining field? The papers have been full of reports of riots that have taken place in the Danville district. Westville and Danville are largely populated by foreigners, Italians, Sicilians, etc., and what have they done? The Benson Coal Company, an auxiliary to the Illinois Steel Trust, has been sending its agents among the foreigners and telling them that the officials of the United Mine Workers are betraying them and selling them out and using the finances for their own personal gain. They do not go to the American or the Americanized foreigner, but they go to the recent immigrant and they get agents of their own nationality to create dissension in the ranks of organized labor. They would not dare to go to an American with an agent and tell him that the officials are selling them out, that they are spending the finances of the organization for their own personal gain, because the Americanized foreigner knows better. He is able to sum up the situation, but these recent immigrants are of such a temperament that when they once get aroused there is no power on earth that can quell them. They even threatened to mob the officials of the organization. It was not the Americanized foreigner, but the recent immigrant.

One of the comrades says Americans are scabs. I admit that all the scabs are not confined to foreigners, though there are quite a number of them among the foreigners. But the protest of the foreigner on the economic field has been spasmodic and not of long endurance. When once their desire has been fulfilled, when the employer concedes to a spasmodic revolt, it is not of long duration, but immediately thereafter the employer can impose the same condition upon them

and they will stand it until they rise up again with the same ignorant revolt. Down in Granite City we have a great steel plant that is manned mostly by foreigners. The wages are so low that the Americanized foreigner won't go into them.

The railroads are in the same condition. You do not see an American or Irishman or Americanized foreigners working on the section any more. The wages are such that they cannot live on them. So they take the recent immigrant and put him on there, because he sleeps in a box and can live on a few cents a day.

These are practical propositions that we have to deal with. I know we have beautiful maxims in our Socialist philosophy. The pages of the world's history are filled with beautiful maxims, but beautiful maxims do not solidify the ranks of the working people. It takes practical propositions and concrete action, and nothing else.

A comrade says that if he had simply to make a choice between the little fellow and the big fellow he would choose the large fellow. That is one of the propositions that the Illinois miners are up against now. The employers insist that the miners' organization concede to a solidification of the employers. In other words, they want to give us a closed shop. The closed shop is this, that they will employ no one but members of the United Mine Workers, providing the members of the United Mine Workers will agree to work for no one but members of the Illinois Coal Miners Association. We do not think this big fellow is going to redound to our interest in carrying out any such proposition. Let us take the working conditions, let us take the wages that are being paid in independent industries; compare the wages of the working men in the independent steel plants with those paid by the trust; compare the wages of the independent coal miners with those of the organized coal miners; take any industry and compare the wages and condition of the working men in the trust concerns with those of the independents, and not in one instance will you find the advantage in favor of the big fellow. You will be able to combat the little fellow and defeat him much quicker than you can the man with millions and millions of dollars back of him. It is true that it is harder to get concerted action on the

part of the small men and difficult to organize all the little fellows in order to make a united stand, a united attack upon the organized labor of this country. But as to the small fellow, it has been my experience that they have been able to get better concessions and bring better conditions and better wages from him than from the united capitalist class. Therefore, I hope that the substitute offered by Comrade Hillquit will be adopted.

DEL. HECKALA (Wyo.): I will be brief, but I will try to explain my opinion on this question. I am not going to discuss personalities, either my personality, or the personality of the Chinese or Japanese, but I am going to give my opinions as to what position is of the most benefit to the Socialist movement of the United States. Now, I think the majority report is somewhat materialistic, and that the minority report represents the side of humanity. Now, which of these two is of most value to the Socialist movement of the United States? If we stand for humanity it means that line of action where our reforms are tied up to one method, or means that any method which is out of the humanity line will not be accepted. Therefore, this ties us down to one line of action. I consider the majority report as materialistic, which means that by accepting it we are obeying the present day means of action. I consider the minority report not much varying from the report which was presented here yesterday. I do not think it varies much, but still I think it the best method of dealing with this question, and that we will accept Comrade Hillquit's substitute.

DEL. HAINES (Tenn.): I shall claim your indulgence but a few minutes, as I am suffering from a physical disability, and dare not if I would excite my vocal organs. I sympathize with our comrade that spoke some time ago, from the fact that I am in a similar condition and position as he was. It is my first appearance before such an august body, and, therefore, whilst I am not disposed to make any apologies for being in any way deficient in intellect and want of education, I am ready to take and support and sustain the ideas which I consider should be entertained by Socialists. I am a southern delegate. We just heard from a southern delegate, and I have listened during the discus-

sion today with divided feelings. I have been trying to get at the facts, to get some evidence to back up or substantiate the argument of the two or three reports that have been submitted to us. I cannot entirely agree with either the majority or the minority report, or even the substitute or the substitute to the substitute. I cannot help thinking that there is much in the majority report that is commendable. There are some things in the minority report that I could not entertain. I noticed in the majority report that Comrade Untermann called attention to certain conditions that existed in the south, and he said if we were to go down there and talk to the negro what would he say to you? Well, that might be true, and I would not blame him if he did, when I take into consideration certain conditions that exist in the south. I noticed, too, that some of the comrades in speaking upon the question of trade unionism and the question of strikes and strike breakers, took strong exception to the statement that the strike breakers were Americans. I said with some of the others, "That is true." But the question, when my southern comrades were taking exception to that view, the question rose in my mind, what constitutes an American? Is it a certain gentleman in a uniform with bright buttons? They are the fellows that clubbed down the strikers in Philadelphia. I presume they had to be Americans before they could get those uniforms, but I maintain they are emigrants that struck down the unions.

A DELEGATE: There was not a Chinaman on the force.

DEL. HAINES: No, there was not likely to be; a Chinaman has got too much sense to go among a crowd like that. Now, I am speaking as a Socialist. I could not possibly support any measure whatever that would disfranchise or exclude any nationality, I care not who it may be. Our good sister called our attention to certain conditions that existed locally. Those same conditions will apply at other parts of the country as well as on the Pacific Coast. It is wonderful what an emphasis is put on that Pacific slope. It is only a question of time when they will have another earthquake and it will slope off of the slope and there will be no slope left for either Americans or Chinamen. A good brother from New York, speak-

ing about the trade unions, said we will take a stand for the entire exclusion policy. What have they ever done for Socialism, the trade unionists? They are an exclusive organization, and I know what they would do for Socialists if they had the chance; they would swipe them off, not only from America, but from all other countries. That is the position of the trade unionists on the American continent today. Who is it that is wearing scab coats, if the trade unionists don't do it? Now, we have nothing to fear from the trade unionists along this line. I want to tell you that Fred Warren may go to the penitentiary, but Sam Gompers never. Fred Warren may be mulcted in \$15,000 fine, but John Mitchell never. Why? Because they are anxious to keep the Chinaman out of the Pacific slope. I want to say this, that the same conditions prevail in the different parts of this country that prevail on the Pacific slope. You talk about your Chinamen becoming skilled railroad men and engineers. In nearly fifty years' experience I have never known a Chinaman yet to come and take an engineer's job from him. I have never known a Chinaman yet to scab on a street car man. I have never known a Chinaman, Japanese, Hindoo or Korean to take the places of any skilled laborers when a strike was on for the protection of that skilled labor. Therefore I maintain that the question of the Asiatic coming into America is only a bugbear and a bugaboo to frighten you into supporting trade unionists who would make no concessions to you, but would destroy you a thousand times if they could. We have a sister here from Lynn, Massachusetts, I believe. I ran on what they called the narrow gauge railroad out there, the first job I ever had on the American continent, and I was offered a wage there as an Englishman that I had never been offered in England since I was twenty-four years of age, as an engineer, and because I refused to take and do the work on that road I was

blacklisted from Philadelphia to the Canadas, and I know something about the conditions that have existed in the east on this continent. During that time Powderly was making himself effective. Gompers became jealous over it, and the American Federation of Labor was organized for what? Gompers has threatened more than a thousand times that he never would allow it to be the means of leading the labor organization into any political movement. And yet we find the time has come at the last election that he wanted you to vote for your friends and punish your enemies, and at the same time he was going to the banquets of the Civic Federation. These are the men and these are the parties that we are asked to support in their exclusion policy, entirely for fear you should hurt these gentlemen's feelings. Delegate Strelbel moved that the congress adjourn at 7 o'clock, it then being 6:50, and that the first order of business tomorrow morning shall be the summing up of the reporters, after which the vote shall be taken.

The motion was seconded and carried.

After a few announcements, the congress at 7 o'clock adjourned until 9:30 A. M., Wednesday, May 18.

BANQUET.

On Tuesday evening, May 17, a banquet given by Local Cook County to the visiting delegates took place at King's restaurant, Fifth Avenue, near the National headquarters. Delegate Carl D. Thompson was elected toastmaster, his duties being limited to making an introductory speech, introducing the first speaker, who in turn selected and introduced his or her successor. The banquet was largely attended, and was unanimously pronounced a success. Among the speakers were Morris Hillquit, J. F. Carey, Winnie Branstetter, Oscar Ameringer, Lena Morrow Lewis, William D. Haywood, Seymour Stedman, J. F. Nash, Arthur M. Lewis, Geo. D. Brewer, Dora B. Montefiore of England.

FOURTH DAY'S SESSION.

The Congress was called to order at 9:30 A. M. by Secretary Roewer.

Delegate Mayor Emil Seidel of Milwaukee was elected Chairman for the day, and on taking the gavel was greeted with hearty cheers.

THE CHAIRMAN: I must criticise you for that, comrades. I thought you were more class conscious than to cheer an individual. I thought you would cheer the cause if you cheered anything.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): That is what we did, Emil.

THE CHAIRMAN: Cut out the person. I am only one of the many grains of sand that help to make the soil upon which we expect to build the future civilization. I did not expect to make a speech at this time, and I do not intend to do so. I want to acquaint myself with my duties and do the work as we are accustomed to do it in Milwaukee; when we are called upon to do a thing we proceed to do it and try to lose as few words over it as possible.

Now, comrades, I want to give you the cheer of Milwaukee. I want to assure you that Milwaukee is with you. And if there was one thing we wished after we got through rejoicing over our victory, my comrades of the United States, from every corner of this nation, I want to tell you it is this one thing, that we wished that you would do as we had done, and we know that you can do as we have done provided you will get down on your hands and feet and begin work. That is the only thing. I don't tell you to get together. I tell you to get busy. That is what is wanted. If anything is needed today, men of this party, men of this congress, and women of this congress, it is that we begin to roll up our sleeves, and put on jeans if necessary, and knuckle down to work. Humanity is waiting for you. The conditions are ripe. Everybody is looking for you. The old parties have failed. They cannot make good. There is somebody wanted that will make

good. And we are the ones who can make good. Marx has given you tools; use them to do the work.

The other men who have led this movement in the old world and in the new have given you tools; apply them.

Try to learn how to apply them to modern conditions. Don't think that I must wear my glasses like you do before we can do something. Don't think that I must eat my meat just as you do before we can do something. Don't think that we must all learn to use the knife and fork alike, or all learn to read a book in the same way, or that we must all think in one direction before we can do something.

Socialism will never come about if it requires men and women of one size, of one stature, of one frame of mind, of one attire, of one color or of one creed. You will never bring Socialism about in that way. Never mind how I look, never mind how I sit, never mind whether my education is as good as yours; it does not make any difference. Never mind whether I understand Marx, even. If I understand the real needs of the common people, and can give them what they need, if you can do that, then the people are with you. You may call that what you like. But I must stop right here. I hope that we shall get right down to business. I hope that we shall get right down to work. If you will tell me what is the next order of business, Mr. Secretary, we will proceed.

But remember this, comrades; it is not the person who counts; it was not Seidel who was the winner in Milwaukee. It was hard work that was the winner. We have there what we call the bundle brigade. They worked every Sunday morning; they worked every day. Many of them made Socialists better than the orators could have done, because they spoke so that the workmen could understand them. Let us see if I can speak so that you will understand me.

I understand the order of business

is the question of Immigration. I believe there are a number of speakers on the list. I understand you discussed this all day yesterday, and if you think you can settle it right, perhaps it would be better to discuss it all day today.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): A point of order. The first order of business is the approval of the minutes of the Monday session. There being no corrections offered I move that the minutes be approved.

The minutes were approved.

DEL. HOLM (Scand.): A great deal has been said already by the orators and high priests of our party, and I trust it will not appear entirely a waste of time for one who is not an orator, but just one of the rank and file, to try to add anything to the discussion. But being a representative from one of the foreign nationalities and being a foreigner myself I cannot let this occasion pass without raising my voice in a protest against the attempt to stain the fair name of Socialism and the Socialist Party of America, and against an attempt to crucify democracy in the party. Sentences like the "universal brotherhood of man," or the "rights of man," may be mere phrases, but I must say that for me they have a very deep meaning, and I am not yet ready to sacrifice my principles in order to gain the favor of some labor leader, or to gain a few votes. It was love of those principles that brought me into this party. It was love of those principles that sent me into the "bundle brigade" that the Comrade Chairman was talking about. That brought me out last night into the rain after the meeting here, when I had to go to the union through the rain and pass out a bundle of Daily Socialists and the Appeal to Reason to the audience. If I should sacrifice those principles what should I vote for? To gain some office for somebody? I for one am not yet ready to do it.

But to come to the Immigration question, I must say that I was disappointed yesterday. I came here prepared to learn; I came here prepared to hear a mass of facts; to hear a statement of facts that could be proved; especially when these statements were all made beforehand that the immigration of the Asiatic races was so much more detrimental in lowering the standard of living, here

among the working class. This issue is not new. I know in my Branch of the Socialist Party among both the English and the Scandinavian members this question has been discussed for years. I tried to get all the facts that I for my part could glean from the public library here, and it is not so very small, and all the arguments, pro and con, from the different Senatorial and Congressional Committees, but they did not teach me very much. So I came here yesterday prepared to get the facts. And I first hear the lengthy statement from the majority of the committee appointed two years ago, those intellectual giants of our party, and what did we hear? I, for my part, did not get one single fact. The comrade from the Pacific Coast did tell us just a little about the matter to weaken the other side. We heard from one comrade from Washington that if you go into the countries where the Chinaman and the Jap are working you will see dirt and filth when they are packing the fish into the cans, with their opium pipes between their fingers. For Heaven's sake, comrades, I can take you over to the Ghetto here and show you the houses where they make the fine garments that you see here in the windows of the stores on State street and show you the filth and dirt in those places where they make them. We can take you to little Italy, "little hell," as we call it in Chicago, across the river here, and if you dare to follow me down into the basements of those houses I will show you where they make the chocolate candies that you see in the stores, and that maybe you eat, and where the spaghetti and the macaroni are made that you get in some of your restaurants, and you will see dirt and filth there.

Being a foreigner I lack the command of the English language to describe to you properly the filth and dirt you will see in those places. So you see it is not merely the Chinese and the Japanese that are filthy.

Again we are told that the Chinese can live on ten cents' worth of rice. I, for my part, would rather live on that than on two big onions and a piece of black bread, and that is what many of the people in the Ghetto are getting.

Then Comrade Berger tells us about the five million Chinamen that will come over here. Yes; we may get scared about a lot of things. We were

told a few days ago that the comet was coming to end everything, but I don't believe that Comrade Berger made his will yesterday because of it. And so far as Chicago is concerned today, we seem to have very fair weather, comet or no comet.

Now if the Chinese and the Japanese will really lower the standard of living more than the other foreigners coming to these shores—for myself, I have never come in contact with this coolie labor from China and Japan, but I have tried to gather the facts within the last few years from friends of my own nationality, being a Norwegian myself, and from some Scandinavians who have worked in the lumber camps and the railroad camps of the west—and I suppose some of those would be called "blanket stiffs"—I have been trying to gather some facts from them. It is true that many of them, when you mention the Chinese, will say: "Keep the damned Chinks out," because they hate them; just as they will say: "Keep the damned niggers out," because they hate the negro, or "Keep the damned dagoes out," because they hate the Italians, but the thinkers among them, those who know a little bit, those who are really worth talking to on economic questions, I gather from them that the camps where the Asiatics are, are cleaner than the camps where the Irish and the Scandinavians were. And I learned that the Chinese and the Japs would not stand the abuse from the bosses as much as some of the European nationalities. That does not show much danger of lowering the standard of living.

But there was another thing that I was told. I was told that the Asiatics are very economical; they are very saving; and they try with all their power to get into a little business of their own, open a hotel or a restaurant or a store, and so forth. And there the small white business man cannot compete with them.

Now, Comrade Untermann said that our real enemy is not the small capitalist; it is the big one. I ask you, are we here to take up the fight of the middle class or are we here to take up the fight of the proletarian workingmen?

In closing, I want simply to say that if it is the destiny of the world that the Asiatic race is to overthrow the Caucasian race no exclusion act, and

no restriction act, even from Milwaukee, can prevent it.

But I do take issue with those comrades who say that the Socialist Party will obtain control of the United States of America and usher in here the co-operative commonwealth before other nations. We have seen what capitalism has done in those other countries in the past two years.

In conclusion, I want to say, don't sacrifice your principles. I read something said years ago, and I am reminded of it because I saw it in the Daily Socialist yesterday; and I ask the comrades who have the power to vote here, which I have not, to bear it in mind when they vote on this question, and I ask the comrades from Milwaukee to bear it in mind, that only he who is led by the heart can gain the ultimate goal.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next speaker on the list is Delegate Hubschmitt.

DEL. HUBSCHMITT (N. J.): I beg to waive my privilege in order to facilitate matters and get to a vote. (Great applause.)

DEL. KILLINGBECK (N. J.): We are wasting time. Our deliberations on this matter remind me of the famous tailors of Tooley street, who resolved that the British Empire should be abolished. And we are attempting to do here what you and I really know is an impossibility so long as the present capitalistic regime stays in business.

We have been told that it is sentimental gush, this plea for the Asiatic. Possibly it is gush. I really believe so myself; but remember this, that you cannot build up a revolutionary movement unless you have some of this sentimental gush in that movement. There is no one in the world more proud that we have the Socialist mayor of Milwaukee presiding at this Socialist National Congress than I am. But, friends, we shall require infinitely more than the practical sort of Socialism that has made Milwaukee famous before we can reach Washington and place ourselves in a position where we can exclude or let in the Asiatic as we choose.

Some of the speakers have tried to prove to you that this is not a racial question. But almost every speaker who has spoken in favor of exclusion has dwelt on the fact that they are a distinct race, that they are of such a race and heredity that it is impossible

that they should amalgamate with us and become a part of this nation. Why, in my own city of Orange, New Jersey, I have stood at the gate of the Edison works—and you have all heard of the famous Thomas Edison—he is a neighbor of mine, but we do not visit each other, we belong to different classes—I hope you will pardon the phrase—and at that gate of the Edison works you will see five hundred to seven hundred men, representing practically every nation in the world, waiting to be bought like cattle every morning. And when I see those men I think that we on the Eastern coast have got an immigration problem. I know that there are thousands of Americans who have lost their jobs, have lost their right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, from the influx of these foreigners who come not only to the Pacific coast, but to the Atlantic coast as well. But as Socialists, we of the Eastern coast do not propose to shut our doors and say that they cannot come in. I remember being in a pretty little city of New Jersey a few weeks ago, called Redbank, and there was a strike there in a clothing factory, a place where they make uniforms for the professional murderers of this country—and the Italians made those uniforms and they went on strike for better conditions and for the purpose of having the right to organize a labor union. What happened? The next day a train of cars came—a train of eleven cars—from New York, loaded with Russian Jews, who came to scab on the Italian strikers, and who succeeded in breaking the strike.

Now I am not saying a word against our comrades, the Russian Jews. As a Socialist I recognize that economic determinism compelled them to do what they did. But if the Asiatic is such a menace and a peril to this country, why not apply the same reasoning to the South of Europe? Let us be fair. That is the point. If we do believe in protecting the so-called American working man, let us go to the limit and say: "Close every door; stop them all from coming in." Let us be honest with ourselves and say that we want a political victory and in order to get that victory we must have the co-operation of the American Federation of Labor, and say to them: "We are willing to have you dictate to the Socialist Party just what we shall do,

so that we can make other cities and states as famous as Milwaukee.

Now, friends, I am not an imperialist, neither am I an utter opportunist; but I do believe in being frank. If we take the stand that immigration is bad, and I believe that, directly, it is bad, let us be frank and say that we stand with a reactionary labor organization for the purpose of winning a political victory, and that not only will we exclude the Chinaman and the Jap and the Hindoo but we will go to the limit and stop the French Canadian, the Russian Jew, the Pole, the Syrians, the Greeks, the men who have created this problem for us in the east, as the others have created this problem on the Western coast.

DEL. ESTHER LAUKKI (Minn.): Being a Finlander, I presume you ought to expect that I shall stand on the side of the Japanese because we are said to be Mongolians, and so I shall stand for them. First of all, the weight of this question seems to depend on the fact that in certain sections of our country the working men are suffering because of the Japs coming. Well, now, I am from Minnesota, where we have fought for the Western Federation of Miners. Two or three years ago they organized the miners. In that section are the largest iron mines in the world. There the miners struck good and hard. We had an organization composed mainly of Finlanders, with some Italians and Austrians. Who was it came to break up our strike? It was the Slavs of Southern Europe. Now, I don't claim that Minnesota is as important or as large as California. We do know that immigration is an important question for the workingman. But if you ask for the exclusion of the Japs, then I ask for the exclusion of the Southern Slavs. Then, if I do that, I am sure the Slavs will ask for the exclusion of my countrymen, the Finlanders. It is utterly impossible for an international country like the United States to try to exclude any race. We can't do it. If we keep on trying to exclude one race after the other we shall finally be left with the absurdity of trying to exclude each other. I know Comrade Berger told us that he would fight like a tiger for his wife and his children. And I tell you if he forces us to take Japanese exclusion I may in the future try to get my countrymen to try to exclude

Comrade Berger and his German relatives.

Now let us suppose that laws are enacted excluding Asiatics from America. What would that bring us to? We Socialists are supposed to understand economic laws. If we exclude, it will result the same as we have found it in Minnesota, where the steel trust has as strong a grip as it has in Pennsylvania, and where Jim Hill holds people down as tight as he does in Pennsylvania. In Minnesota I have a baby. You have heard about that baby. In Minnesota, when you go on the railroad, and have a baby carriage, you have to put it in the baggage car—you will, if you go on Jim Hill's railroads, and he will charge you a quarter for it. He is a citizen of our state; he says so himself; and he is the boss there. I tell you, if we exclude the Japs and the Chinese and he wants to use the Jap and the Chinaman for cheap labor, what is he going to do? Then he will import people from the southern states of Europe, and if we prevent that, what will he do? Just what capitalism always does; he will improve his machinery, and then, what are you going to do, unless we go back to the time when the working men broke up the machines? We may strike against the machinery, but we shall gain nothing by trying to exclude the Japs and Chinese, or any other individual race.

I think, so far as I understand the Socialist theory, that we Socialists stand on the basis of the solidarity of the working men of the world. Then, is our object to gain an advantage from one body of working men at the expense of another body of working men? I think that, no matter how we may try to gain some benefit for ourselves, the main object should always be to get some benefit for all the workers. It is not as in the old trade union days when one union, to get some benefit, would do so at the expense of another trade union. We know that the Federation of Labor is a very large organization, but compared with all the workers there are in the United States they are very small in number, and if we are just going to fight for their benefit and not for all the workers of America I think we are very foolish.

I am in favor, by all means, of preventing the capitalists from importing labor, from trying to bring about artificial immigration from foreign coun-

tries. I think we should help the labor organizations in all their fights, and if there is anything we want to do it is to stand for laws that will permit that; and I think that is all covered by Comrade Hillquit's motion. I think that that will prohibit the importation of strike breakers from foreign countries to break down our labor organizations. I think that there we Socialists will strike the real thing that the American Federation of Labor is trying to get at. I think that instead of telling the Japs that they cannot come to our country we should try to bring about co-operation of the workers in all the countries, and when we have strikes in different countries tell the workers in the other countries—and we shall have to do this in the future—tell the men in the other countries not to come to that country where the strike is and help to break down the labor organizations. We shall gain more by that than from any foolish attempts to exclude a race from America.

DEL. LEWIS (Oregon): We Socialists are a peculiar set of fellows. If the capitalists had it in their power they would exclude every Socialist on this floor from America, and we are following right in their paths. We would exclude the undesirable races. I can't understand it. And then we call ourselves International Socialists, working for the brotherhood of man. But we have got our favorites. We find a lot of fellows who can command four or five dollars a day as skilled mechanics and those skilled mechanics must be protected and common labor go to hell. Is that the idea of the congress? What have we come to? Don't we understand the development of capitalism by the reduction of the skilled laborers to the unskilled by the perfection of machinery? Don't we understand that we are all destined to become proletarians? What are we fighting for? Are we fighting for the A. F. of L. or for the whole working class. The A. F. of L. is not the working class. That has been proven right on this platform by the delegates who are members of the A. F. of L. The A. F. of L. represents the upper class that is also represented in the Civic Federation.

We have heard here about assimilation and non-assimilation. What has that to do with this question? They talk of degrading our own working class. Ours! Just as if we could

separate out one portion of the working class and work for that class and not work against the other portions of the working class. Why, if it is our class, it is our class all over the world.

Then we also have on the coast this Hindoo question. Now, I want to say that I represent the blanket stiffs, and if there is one local that does represent the blanket stiff, or that is confronted with the Asiatic question or the Hindoo question, it is Local Portland, Oregon, and you have heard from the telegram here to-day where we stand. We are not afraid of the Asiatics. We are afraid of one thing—the ignorance of the American working man.

Now we are supposed to study and to understand economic determinism. Yet one of our comrades said here yesterday that we are on an elevator and if a ring means to go up he wants to be on it, and if it rings to go down then he wants to get off. You see; we have got up a little bit and since we are up a little bit we must live at the expense of those that are down. We must not try to bring the others up with us. We must take care of ourselves. We are the superior beings. But we must remember, that if the fight in the past was to bring us up to where we are to-day it is now our duty to fight to bring our comrades where we are to-day.

Another thing I am surprised at. One comrade said he was for the little man as against the big man. Why, doesn't he know that the greatest enemies of the working men are these cockroach business men. That is the class that was used by the great capitalists to try to hang Haywood and Moyer and Pettibone. That is the element that would hang Comrade Germer, if it had the chance. Still he stands for the little man: I can't understand it. We are told that there are two classes, and he stands for the little squealer. That is, the little fellow that says: Bust the trust. And Comrade Germer says he is going to help bust the trust. I never heard anything like it right here in a Socialist assembly. We have got to get the big fellows out of the way, of course, finally and then we shall all be the big fellows.

Now, although I don't approve of the majority report by any means, the minority report does not exactly meet my views either, Hillquit's is a little too long, and I have no apologies to make

for Comrade Lee's at all. I did have an idea to present, but it is held back; it is more condensed, so that each and every working man can understand it. That is what we must do, have a resolution so short and so plain that every working man can understand it when he reads it. You see, we have so many lawyers and professional men that have such a beautiful and extensive vocabulary that they have to spit out an awful lot of words every time before they say anything. Now, hear this "Resolved by the Socialist Congress of America, that we are opposed to the system of stimulated or mass immigration for the purpose of reducing the standard of living, and acting as strike breakers, but we welcome all voluntary immigration of all races."

I think that covers the whole thing. Probably, if we had had something like that yesterday we would now be working on the constitution.

So on behalf of Portland, Oregon, the telegram from which place speaks more eloquently than I can, I say to you that we are opposed to the exclusion of any race.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): While age and experience do not bring infallibility they certainly are worthy of a hearing. When Berger, Hillquit, Spargo, Wanhoppe and Lee present a deliberately stated proposition to the Socialists of the United States it commands respect. At least three of those comrades have occupied the high and honorable position of International Secretary. And therefore, whatever the proposition, it comes with a force greater than it could possibly have coming from an obscure member of the party; it carries with it the honors that the party has given to them. I simply wish now to discuss their proposition with sixty-three years back of me, thirty-six of which has been spent in the Socialist party. I have been to all your conventions, but my voice has rarely been heard; and I want you to listen to me now on this fundamental question that has come up for your consideration.

Had the majority report and the minority report alone remained for you to consider, I should not have broken my silence. I should have remained quietly in my seat, satisfied that the debate would have gone the way that the principles of international Socialism require. There is no question in my mind that the majority report would

have been overwhelmingly defeated. The minority report, with all its imperfections, would have been adopted. But I became alarmed when these honorable gentlemen and comrades, recognizing their defeat, introduced a substitute to set—

DEL. WOLFF (Jewish Agi. Bu.): A point of order: that the comrade has no right to impugn the motives or honesty of a comrade who presents a motion to this house.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade should try to discuss this in a way that will not be offensive to anyone.

DEL. BERGER: Oh, give him full latitude. He won't hurt any one.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can do that and yet give full expression to our views.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): To my sensitive comrades who think that I have violated the rules of good conduct on this platform I apologize. To my comrades who have remained silent, I will say that any imperfections in my conduct you should attribute to thirty-six years of wage labor.

I say I became alarmed as soon as this substitute was introduced, and my alarm was justified, because, following some of the best speeches that have been made on this floor came the climax that they endorsed the substitute. The simple message of the carpenter and the fisherman was understood; the workmen took it; they received it gladly and then the intellectuals took up the message, and carried it along for nineteen hundred years, and who understands it now? No one understands it. The workers organized against their masters and went through the mills until they numbered their thousands and then the intellectuals took possession and now we have a labor movement that sits at the same table with the Civic Federation. Who understands it? We had the Knights of Labor with the finest declaration of principles ever set forth, and then with the help of traitors it landed among the capitalist class, and so it has been with every movement. The simple, plain propositions have been buried in a mass of words. So it has been with the Socialist movement. When I came into the Socialist movement I was a poor ignorant working man. I had no education. I could not write or spell. But I listened to the message: "The Socialist Party is organized to abolish the wage system,

the profit system, the competitive system, and to link the workers of the world in one common bond of brotherhood and to create a commonwealth." And now we have presented here the aims of our propaganda and it takes nine thousand words to tell it. And the same comrade that presents these aims of our propaganda presents this substitute and I think they both hang together, and their purpose is to submerge the primary principles of the Socialist movement and place us in a position where Gompers can understand it, and nobody else can.

Now, study this substitute, take it up and read it, because you are going to vote on it. "The Socialist Party of the United States favors all legislative measures tending to prevent the immigration of strike breakers, contract laborers, or mass immigration of workers from foreign countries." What does immigration mean? It means a voluntary movement of a people. But that is not what it is put in here for. The word there should be, we are opposed to importation. But he would not use that word. No, no. He wants it to read that the Socialist Party is standing for any legislative measure restricting immigration, and he injects strike breakers—

DEL. HILLQUIT: Be honest, Tommy, and read the rest.

DEL. MORGAN: Let me have my say.

DEL. HILLQUIT: But do it honestly.

DEL. MORGAN: I am doing it in my way. That is the only way that I can do it. Every time I speak I hurt somebody. That is the fault of my talk. If I didn't hurt somebody you would applaud me when I got through.

Now read this: "The party is opposed to the exclusion of any immigrant on account of his race or nationality, and demands that the United States be maintained at all times as a free asylum for all men and women persecuted by the governments of their country on account of their politics, religion or race." The Socialist Party stands for those who are persecuted for their politics, religion or race, and those only. They are opposed to all others. Cut out those last words and let it stand, "The party is opposed to the exclusion of any immigrants on account of their race or nationality, and demands that the United States be at

all times maintained as a free asylum for all men and women." There is the gist of it. I have in my library all the platforms of all the political parties that have been adopted in the United States and this substitute takes me back to one of those adopted by the Democrats before the war. They declared that this country is the asylum for the oppressed of all the earth, but are opposed to the agitation for the abolition of slavery. Here we say we are in favor of this being maintained as an asylum for the persecuted ones, but we are opposed to any one who gets up and gets out of his own accord.

Now, it gets down to this: Are you in favor of the open door? Are you in favor of the breaking down of all the barriers separating the working men of the world so that they can intermix and come together voluntarily and work out their own salvation? then you are in favor of the open door. If you are in favor of the exclusion of any portion of the human race, then you are in favor of the closed door. I warn my fellow comrades to have nothing to do with this substitute. And when it comes to a discussion of the aims and objects of the Socialist Party, I wish you would give as close attention to the wording as I have given to that of the substitute.

I want to tell you, my friends, that there is a movement in the Socialist Party, a movement based upon sincerity, upon what these comrades believe is the very best policy to be pursued, and that movement is to suppress the harsh demands and declarations of the party. Every time I have an opportunity to discuss with some man that is young and honest and will admit almost everything I ask him: Are you in favor of slavery? No. You are against it? Certainly. Do you want to abolish the relation of master and servant? No. I have asked our Milwaukee comrades not to use the words employer and employee; I have asked our local comrades not to use those words. They simply submerge the relationship that exists to-day. The relation that exists to-day is that of master and servant. I, as a Socialist, would print all over a man, so that whenever he went to the looking glass he would see it, that he was a servant, a serf. I would like to put a label all over the Socialists: "We are organized to abolish the relation of master and servant." That is

where we stand; not for the modification of that relationship.

Let us be true to the motto on the button we wear; let us be true to the international character of this movement, and if you vote for this minority report you will do that. The minority report stands for an unswerving support of international proletarian Socialism and the majority report and the substitutes are a repudiation of that doctrine.

DEL. HAINES (Tenn.): I rise to make an apology, if you please, and an excuse, that is, if there are any more speakers who are Englishmen, that an Irishman is always allowed to speak twice in order that he should be understood, but an Englishman, as often as he likes and as long as he likes. I find that my fellow countryman who has just spoken has been misinterpreted in the way he has expressed himself and you will kindly pardon him, if you please.

DEL. PASSAGE (N. Y.): The occasion seems to afford excellent opportunity for hyperbolical declamation, verbal pyrotechnics, and heroic attitudinizing, and many of those who have addressed us have taken good advantage of the opportunity. Lest I should be accused of the same method, I shall try to confine myself to a candid statement of my present attitude of mind as the arguments have appealed to me. I do not think the methods I have described lead towards political success in our movement or in its business deliberations. And political success for our movement, it seems to me, is identical with the most rapid possible achievement of our ultimate ideals for a condition of society in which we can practice as well as profess the principles of the brotherhood of man.

I am an exclusionist, at any rate in this sense: that I would exclude from our declarations and resolutions all things that are extraneous to the economic and political fundamentals of our movement, because I think that, whenever those things are introduced, they serve but to cause a division and not unity. I hold that the International Congress has no right to impose upon the Socialists of all the countries in the world the declaration that has been quoted here as a principle of Socialism. They may express it as their notion of the policy that should be pursued.

But I refuse to have it charged that, because I do not accept that principle, my Socialism, so far as its fundamental principles are concerned, has been brought into dispute. And there has been no argument yet on this floor to convince me that as a Socialist, I may not vote for the majority or the minority report, or the substitute. I do not think the adoption of any one of them would necessarily mean that the Socialist movement was going to smash on that account. It is an inference that is entirely unwarranted and serves the cause of pessimism and disunity and not the cause of hope and unity and success.

Now, in trying to make this a principle of Socialism it seems to me that we are a bit inconsistent. Both those that favor the minority and the majority report, in a time of domestic labor trouble do their very best to exclude from employment at the particular place where the labor trouble occurs those whom they denominate scabs because they try to break a strike. Now, judging from some of the expressions here by those who favor the minority report in deference to the principle of solidarity we have no right to exclude men who desire employment even in domestic labor troubles on the occasion of a strike. It seems that they think it would be a violation of the principle of solidarity to do so. On the other hand I contend that we are quite justified in trying to exclude them on such occasions on the ground that the success of a strike ultimately means the advancement of the principle of solidarity, and that the defeat of a strike means the postponement of the realization of solidarity.

I wish to reiterate what Comrade Berger said, that when Marx said, "Workers of the world, unite," he did not mean to unite all in one place. To me it means workers of the world; that is, in any nation where you are in conflict with the forces of capitalism, unite. I believe the organization of labor ought to be such that it would be possible and easy for all the workers to unite in one organization; that is the slogan of the old Knights of Labor: the interest of one is the concern of all. We should strive to that end; and in the process of evolution we shall reach that position, no doubt.

It seems to me, comrades, that if we adopt the substitute offered by Comrade Hillquit, that because of its care-

ful avoidance of a precipitation of a condition that we cannot meet as we go before the workers of this country at this time, it ought to be adopted, and that in the end it will best serve the cause of solidarity and the brotherhood of man.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I stand fundamentally on the position taken by the comrade who has just preceded me. I believe we have the right to exclude, if the class struggle makes it necessary, any race or nation at any given time. I believe in it as a matter of principle. On the same principle that we ask the working class at any given time not to come to a certain place where there is a strike. I am opposed to the theory of natural rights. I do not believe in that theory. I do not believe in the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as a natural right. That is not my philosophy. I am not an anarchist in my philosophy.

I have one more point that I wish to make before I sit down and that is in reply to something said by my comrade Lewis from Oregon. He said: "We are not afraid of the Asiatic; but we are afraid of the ignorance of the American working man." I should like to ask this: By the unrestricted immigration of the Asiatic are you going to increase the intelligence of the American workingman? Are you?

One point more. I have been interested in Comrade Morgan's argument; it was well put. But I do not agree with him that we must wait for the amalgamation of the entire world before we can have the co-operative commonwealth. The world is yet large, and if we are to amalgamate and assimilate the world, and if we are to wait until all the Asiatics have reached the same standard that we have reached, if we are to wait until we have brought the Hindoo and the Afghan and the Tibetan to our level, we shall have to wait a very very long time. I do not want to wait that long. I believe we can do more to usher in the co-operative commonwealth by a careful planful building up of it here, and assisting the comrades in other parts of the world in their efforts. If Germany can establish a Socialistic state, if Germany can establish the co-operative commonwealth, it will be the means of compelling all Europe to follow. Has not the organization of the German democracy been the means of

assisting not only the comrades of the rest of Europe, but of America also? Let us build up a movement here that is strong; let us march carefully and planfully to capture the economic and political powers of this country.

One point more; supposes this coming fall we do elect a congressman from Milwaukee. They claim they are going to do it. As a serious proposition I believe we should consider it, because this matter is imminent. We are soon going to elect congressmen. Shall we take the position that the Socialist Party is not to have an expression upon this great issue? Suppose your congressman is asked by the comrades of the west to introduce a measure to protect the workers of the west from mass immigration, and he should say: The party took no stand and I can take no stand; we have no position on this point." I believe we should have a position on this matter; that we should go on record as the majority report says and say that if at any time mass immigration threatens the interest of the working class, we may and shall exclude it, and that it shall be the duty of our congressmen to introduce such a measure and work far its passage.

DEL. VALIMAKI (Finnish Sec.): Comrades, I do not want to take up much of your time, because we have already spent too much time on this question, but I rise to state the position of the Finnish national organization on this important question before the house now. The Finnish organization is not willing to go on record as favoring the exclusion of the Japanese and Chinese and Hindoos as races, but we do want to go on record as opposing mass immigration from those countries. We have no statistics here to show what proportion of the Japanese and Chinese coming to the Pacific slope is contract labor, but I know from personal experience in the western states that the proportion is large. I was one of the blanket stiffs in the State of Washington at the time of the Russo-Japanese war, and at that time it became commonly known that the Japanese that were called back by their government to fight in Manchuria had a contract with the Great Northern and Northern Pacific railway companies. You cannot always say that those men that are

brought here by the capitalist class are brought here by contract. The American working man does not understand just how big is the mass of immigrants that are brought here to the United States by the capitalist class. I will give you one instance. Take the European immigration. All the immigrants that are here now have newspapers among them, newspapers that do not stand for the rights of the working class, but stand for the rights of the small fry or the small business men who are skinning these immigrants. These newspapers as a rule want to have more immigrants in this country. They want to have as many as possible that they can skin, that they can sell to, and that is why they are always advocating in their newspapers that the immigrants from the northern countries of Europe should come over here. The companies and big corporations also buy pages in the European papers. Only a few weeks ago we had an example of it. The lumber jacks, the men that work in the woods of Michigan and Wisconsin, were getting rebellious, and the steel trust, in order to fight a strike in the lumber camps of Wisconsin and Michigan, began to advertise in the papers in Finland, Scandinavia, Bohemia and Poland, I think; well, in most of the countries of Northern Europe. In the Finnish papers in Finland they advertised for two thousand lumber jacks, and if it had not been for the Socialist Press in Finland and Scandinavia they would have got them, but the Socialist Press explained the situation. I believe that the same thing is done in China and Japan, especially Japan. I believe that immigration so stimulated by the capitalist class should be stopped. As a foreigner I do not want to stand for that kind of immigration, because it is not voluntary immigration, but is artificial. We should take into consideration one point also that has not been brought out in the discussion here, and that is that the United States is becoming a country of export. We have begun to export our manufactured products to other countries. China is developing. The markets in China are opening for European and American goods. The propertied classes of the United States, the capitalist classes, are in China looking for a market. But

of the comrade making the majority report.

I will tell you, when you sift this thing right down to the bottom it is altogether what I would call a job problem, plus the wages, and you cannot make anything else out of it. Of all the words in the English language there is nothing that has so much expression and means more to me, especially at the present time, than that simple little word "job." Now, I know what it means; as a working man I know what it means precisely. I have learned something about it. Now, it is this way, and it is of the deepest concern. At the present time, under the present system, if I did not feel wholly concerned with the job problem, if I did not feel as though it was my deepest concern in life at the present time, I would not talk about it. And furthermore, I believe that I never would have become a Socialist if I had not been convinced that Socialism was going to make my job secure and permanent.

Now, I am only going to speak just a moment, and I want simply to impress upon your minds that out there on the Pacific slope we feel and know that which a great many other people study at a distance. I have no criticism to make of these views. Of

course, they cannot get at the problem as we feel it and know it. Now, as a mill worker, as a man who works in a saw mill, I have been in Washington about eighteen years, and I have followed mill work exclusively about twelve years. About eight years ago the Japanese began to come to the State of Washington, and in those eight years I think I have lost something like twelve jobs by the introduction of Japanese in the small towns. I formerly worked out in the small towns and lumber camps and mills. When a person goes into one of those little towns it is a serious matter if he loses his job where there is only one mill and no other place to be employed. I have continually lost those jobs on account of the introduction of Japanese. Finally I got tired of that, and like the vast majority of working men, actual working men, are doing today, I have been drifting into the same state as that of masses of working men that are liable to be thrown out of work by the introduction of this Asiatic labor. I am now in a town of about 30,000 inhabitants, almost ex-

clusively engaged in the lumber and shingle industry, and also the canning industry, the town of Bellingham. Of course, I am not working all the time in one lumber mill. When I get out of a job in one place I go and get one in another mill. Now, several races have been mentioned, particularly the Japanese, Chinese, Hindoos and Koreans. We had an experience in Bellingham a few years ago with the Hindoos. There are something like a dozen mills in the city, and they got a few Hindoos in one of the mills, and then by and by they got a few more in other mills, and the first thing we knew we had about 400 in the city, and, of course, that meant that the men living and working there had to quit, and some of them had to go to work, perhaps something near 400; probably not that many, but a great number. It seems that the workingmen there were looking after their jobs, and all of a sudden, one night very quietly they simply loaded those Hindoos up, rounded them up and sent them out of town. Of course, there was a lot of noise about it, but nobody was hurt. The police were helpless except to take care of the Hindoos as the mill workers rounded them up. You can call it right or wrong, as you please, but there has never been a Hindoo seen in that city since. Now, I do not know whether you approve that method or not, but it settled the problem there.

Now, I think the majority report represents the real action that should be taken by this congress. At least I know that I could not go back to the Pacific Coast and meet the comrades that I am attempting to represent here, unless I did take that stand. Remember, eight years ago there were no Japanese in the State of Washington. Today I am informed that there are approximately 40,000, and they are still coming. I do not know to what extent Oregon and California are affected, but I believe they are troubled in about the same proportion to population as in Washington. Now, for my part, I think the majority report represents the action that should be taken. Of course, we have no power to put our action into effect. It is merely an expression of our opinion. To sum up the whole thing, it is merely the act of protecting the workingman in his job. I tell you that the job at the present time is the import-

ant thing. I have learned something about jobs. I listened with all due respect to every speaker, and I have not heard one of the speakers refer to that important English word, that expressive word, "job," with the single exception of the comrade making the majority report. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. WANHOPE (N. Y.): As one of the committee who is also a part author of the majority report, it is unnecessary to state what my position is upon this question. I may say, however, that to me it seems not to be a question that lends itself to oratory, but rather one that calls for calm, cool and careful deliberation in such an assemblage as this. I am not going to speak in favor of the majority report. Even at this late hour, however, I want to say that through all the deliberations it has seemed to me that the reasons given for the majority report have had absolutely no consideration whatever from the opposition on this floor. This is a question that cannot be met with denunciation, with abuse, with the ascribing of ulterior motives to the people who bring it to your attention.

No matter what the state may be in this congress, you are going to face the question again and again, and as it seems to me, the majority of us have not yet arrived at that point of intellectual maturity where we are seemingly able to grasp the main contention upon which this report was based. I do not say that that contention is absolutely indisputable. It may be a blunder; it may be based upon false premises. But at any rate, I am sorry to say that it did not get the consideration that was due it. This question has only been handled by the opposition in view of the things that were really seemingly subsidiary in the central statement which it tried to convey.

It was stated here again and again by those opposed to this motion that the whole question lay in the immediate economic effect of the importation of Asiatic races.

Again, it was stated that those who got up this document were seeking to ally themselves or curry favor with the American Federation of Labor; just as if the American Federation of Labor is wrong and necessarily wrong in every position that it takes. I do not know that it is worth while to reply

to such alleged arguments. I would merely call your attention to the fact, you of the opposition, that in taunting us with playing to the American Federation of Labor, you, in voting for the substitute, are doing exactly the same thing by standing in favor of the expulsion of contract labor, which is also one of the strong points of the American Federation of Labor.

The central proposition was this: It was based upon the statement that you will find in the majority report, that the people who come from those particular regions are so far back in psychological and evolutionary development that they are not an assimilable quantity in the United States, and that it is not upon their race alone that the position for exclusion stands, but upon race plus environment, two things that are absolutely inseparable. I think that there are few people here who have really any conception of the vast psychological differences that divide the people of Asia from those of the Caucasian race. The Hindoos, the Chinese, and, to a lesser extent I admit, the Japanese, are in an evolutionary stage which is really thousands of years behind that of the European nations. Their conceptions of life, their ideas, coincide with that particular plane of evolution in which they are. It may perhaps elucidate the last statement to say this, that while the British have been in possession of India for 150 years, both of those races, the master race and the conquered race, do not understand each other. The Hindoo looks upon the Englishman as a bad man, while to the Englishman the Hindoo always contains an element of mystery that he cannot fathom. What has happened is this: That the people of India, living in a state where their conceptions are the conceptions of primitive communism to a large extent, have had imposed upon them a capitalist development and a capitalist jurisprudence that it is utterly impossible for them to understand; and the difference between the races means, in the view of us who have got out this majority report, that the mass importation of these people here means that they form a solid block which will add to and intensify the race problems that already have caused so much trouble in this country.

That question is the question that is before this audience. That is the

question which the majority report dwells upon, and that is the question that has been given absolutely no consideration here by the opposition. (Applause.) It is useless to say that this thing may bankrupt the Socialist movement. If we feel that it is not available, if we feel that we are not only violating what we call Socialist principles, but that such a proposition is inadmissible for other reasons, then, of course, we will necessarily vote it down. But this proposition is bound to come before you, and it was the only proposition that the majority, those who composed the majority report, could possibly lay before you from their study of the facts.

This country has been likened to a crucible, a melting pot, into which the various nations of the earth are cast. The position of the majority is this, that the peoples named in the majority report and recommended for exclusion, instead of being easily fused, are practically infusible; that they will form a solid corps of laborers who may perhaps fight for their own nation or race as against our capitalists, but will show no tendency to a working affiliation with the descendants of the Caucasian race, and the immigrants that come from Europe.

It has been stated also that the majority report contains a veiled compliment to the Jews. Let me tell my Jewish friends this: There was absolutely no intention to compliment; that what we stated there was an impartial view that we had gathered from our investigation; that if it had struck us that the Jew was unassimilable, as we believe the Chinese and Hindoos and other races mentioned are, we would have recommended Jewish exclusion also.

As Comrade Berger stated, and he was the only one of the majority who touched upon this question, though I am sorry to say he did not have time to develop it,—we know that the immigrants that come here of the Caucasian race are at least partly assimilable in the first generation, and in the second and third generations they are completely assimilable; which is not the case, however, with those peoples who have been recommended in this majority report for exclusion.

I am sorry that there is no more of the opposition to have the floor upon this question. I have been waiting impatiently for some of them to

come forward and deal with the question from the standpoint that we have laid down here. Instead of that they have contented themselves with the subsidiary results mentioned in the next paragraph, and which this majority report declares will follow from the mass importation of these peoples.

The rest of the support of the majority committee's report I will leave, of course, to Comrade Untermann. I merely want, however, to restate that in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of my associates in this majority report, that the thing has not been considered as it should have been. It may have been perhaps that we have tried to introduce questions here for which the majority of the delegates were not prepared, and to which they had not given any attention. What you may do with this is a matter of indifference to me personally. I incline to believe with the opposition who stand for unrestricted immigration, that there is actually after all no middle ground; that we ought either to stand upon one position or the other. The substitute seems to be in some favor with a large number of delegates here. Against that I have no protest or no question. But it merely means this, that if you adopt the substitute you are simply saying that we do not want to handle this question at this time. That is about all that it means, for it simply is an essential restatement of the position of the International Congress at Stuttgart. I do not say that it is not a logical position. I am inclined to believe that it is, and from what I have seen of the lack of consideration that was given to the essential part of this majority report, I am quite ready to agree that we are not ready to face the problem yet, and that possibly in our state of intellectual learning that we have reached, the substitute best suits the average intelligence of this audience. But none the less the question is only postponed, not settled. I saw from the speeches I have been listening to that we do not know it all. I never make any pretense of that myself. But when I was elected as a delegate on this committee to get out this report and had given the matter what study I possibly could, I soon saw that it could not be disposed of by oratory or by simply stating that it was in opposition to some Socialist principle, but that we ought to try as

much as possible to get hold of the facts and see what the effect of such immigration would be upon this country.

There is little more to say, except that I leave myself at perfect liberty to change my mind on this subject if it so happens that I am continued as one of the members of this Committee on Immigration. We have only been able from the enormous mass of data that we have accumulated to draw certain conclusions, which perhaps have not all the proof behind them and all the facts behind them that they demand. But I think that the discussion itself here has not been after all a waste of time. It has been, so to speak, an intellectual test of the improvement that the Socialist Party has made in knowledge and in the methods of handling debates. Such a proposition at former congresses would, I believe, have received a much more discouraging reception than this question has, and we are inclined to believe that future congresses will deal with such questions as this strictly upon their merits; will not miss the salient points that the committees put forward to sustain their arguments; will not deal with generalities and make appeals to alleged Socialist principles, but will try, if possible, to get at the crux, the essential part of the propositions presented before them, and discuss them calmly, rationally and reasonably as Socialists who understand that they are growing in knowledge and power and membership, and who understand that the future is theirs. (Applause.)

DEL. W. L. O'NEIL (Wyo.): I am only a common laboring man and cannot handle any oratory. But I have been up against the Chinese question a little longer than my comrade from Washington states. Twelve years ago I faced them as a competitor on the O. R. & N. railroad in Oregon. They had just begun to come in then. Under the stress of the flow of people to Alaska the Western workers forgot about their previous fight against Oriental labor. The West has fought Oriental labor harder than any other part of the country. Time and again they have driven the Orientals out, and have only been prevented from bringing about a practical race extermination at the hands of the United States troops and state militia. They have lost their substance as a people. They

have done the best they could in fighting the class struggle. Although it was a fight against a race, we do not make it a fight against a race when we ask for the exclusion of oriental and servile labor. If that includes the Orientals, all right. Under such a policy the Europeans will not be coming here from those countries. It would hold them back and they would stay at home and help develop their own countries and help to build them up. The Orientals are coming in such hordes that they will not only flood the west, but they will flood the east in a short time. Here is the State of Washington represented here by comrades who tell us that according to the statistics there are 120,000 Orientals in the State of Washington today in a population of half a million. Ain't that coming some? Those are all wage workers, those are all laborers displacing labor there. Now, Comrade Untermann has spoken about the white man out there. I want to tell you how it works, because I have been up against the game. I have been a blanket stiff and I have packed my bundle over the country, when it comes down to that. When I went there, went there first, the Oriental was coming in and displacing us as laborers. The next thing he got his food from the big companies and the little merchant along there had his canned goods and everything else left on hand—the goods that the common white laborer used to buy, so that it is a question of fighting for existence. There are phases of oriental labor that the eastern comrades do not understand whatever. They have not been up against the game.

Another thing, I want to speak to my Jewish friends here, because one of them spoke about the ladies, who are supposed to stick by close family ties. And when our Jewish friend spoke about the ladies standing on the side of oriental exclusion, what are they standing for? They are standing for the morals of their children, and I tell you as a man that has been up against the game, it is a serious question, for they talk of causing war over the exclusion of the Japs from the schools of California. Those men go into those schools. They are full grown men; they are not boys, they are not children. You can hardly distinguish them from boys on account of their size, though they call them boys. They go in there in the schools, and do you

want a man to handle your girls of tender years. It is a moral question altogether from the side of Christian civilization or Jewish civilization. Those are the things we are facing, comrades. They are displacing us as laborers, they are lowering the standard of living, and they are also lowering morals. That is what you are facing.

Now, to our Swedish friend, I want to say a word here. I am working in the building trade, and today the Swedes are coming in, probably driven by the class struggle in Sweden. They are coming in our towns in hordes, big numbers of them. They are getting better wages than the American laborer. Why? Some of you people who do not understand much about labor, those of you who do not come in contact with it, do not understand probably that they can be handled in gangs. They can take those men in gangs and handle them, where they cannot handle the American laborer. So, consequently, they are paid a higher wage for the work that they do than the intelligent American laborer. As far as the question of intelligence is concerned, they are just as intelligent as we are.

I want to say something about the Japs, the Chinese and the others. Some of you say the Japs are ignorant foreigners. I want to tell you that in a way they are not an original race, they do not originate things, but they are the greatest mimics on earth. Comrade McDermott told you about how they will come in and go around through the machine shops, and such as that, and it is only a short time when they are running that machine. They go on the U. P. railroad as laborers, and after a while you find them section bosses. Up and down the line of the U. P. there are Japanese foremen, and there is one Japanese roadmaster in the West today.

Now, some of the comrades spoke today about the foreign speaking nationalities being a unit. I do not want the comrades to think that the men in the west are going to stand for exclusion because of religion. We do not want to fight that question. It is going to settle itself. But we do have to fight the oriental. And I want to impress upon your minds another thing. The Hindoo has been left out of this question almost entirely. There are something over three hundred mil-

lion Hindus besides Chinese and Japanese that are going to become competitors. Now, I want to call your attention to the fact that the laboring men are not asking for the exclusion of immigration. They are asking for the exclusion of oriental and servile labor. They are orthodox on Marx and such things as that, when it comes down to that. We are not fighting a race; we are fighting importation which would drive us out of existence. If that is not orthodox, then, of course, I am a little bit off. Another thing, if it comes to the Socialists gaining control in the government I do not want to stand for the endorsement of a capitalist government. All we ask you to stand for here is to help us and the people of the west. If we are not helped we will be back here the next time, and we won't quit coming. We want you to help us in our fight and that is all there is to it.

In some cases the Japanese are becoming owners, but they are not becoming citizens and helpers in this country so much as to make money to take back to Japan and help her pay her debt. An intelligent Japanese told me, "I have got so many hundred dollars that I have saved up. In a few years I will have so many more, and then I will go back to Japan." He said, "I have got five years to stay here." There is one reason why they do that. The comrade here a while ago spoke about their being convicts. Those convicts have got a fixed time to stay here and then they have to go back and report to the Mikado.

Another thing that has been brought up here is the students going over to Japan. I want to tell you something about the students. The strike of the Western Federation of Miners was in a great measure broken, not by the labor bosses, but by the student bosses, by men that had received a technical education in this country.

I do not say it in bitterness, but a whole lot of Socialist philosophers have gone to the west and have not overcome their prejudices. We have got to overcome this prejudice about the west. We heard from a comrade from Nebraska who has been only a few years in the west. Comrade Spargo is not a resident of the west, and Comrade Tom Lewis has just drifted in. The men who have been there and who have borne the brunt of the fight are all on the side of ex-

clusion. We do not want to exclude them as a race because we may have to exclude ourselves from the earth some day as a race, if it comes down to that. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. I. KLAWIER (of the Polish Organization): We are discussing the question of immigration now for the second day. We have heard very many remarks both for and against immigration, but as the delegate from Colorado, if I am not mistaken, Comrade Maynard, stated yesterday, we would like to know the facts, we would like to see the statistics to see why our northwestern comrades are trying to exclude the Japanese or the yellow races from coming to this country. Comrade Untermann, as chairman of the majority committee, has made a strong speech, and Comrade Hillquit spoke, but did not give us a reason for the exclusion of the Japanese race. He told us simply that we of the eastern states or of the most developed industrial states were not acquainted with the conditions prevailing in San Francisco and the State of California or in the northwestern states. As far as we in the industrial centers are concerned, we have got more reason to kick about immigration than the comrades of the south and northwestern states. They complain of just one nationality, the yellow race. We have about twenty different nationalities in the State of Pennsylvania that we have to deal with, and the Americans in the State of Pennsylvania know very well the conditions they have to fight against. The foreigners there come from the old country, and as a matter of fact lower the standard of living and lower the wages of the Americans in the State of Pennsylvania. But they do not cry out, "Go ahead and exclude every foreigner for the simple reason that they are competitors in this country." As a matter of fact, we know very well that this country was built up by foreigners. It is not a matter of fact whether our southern comrades or the comrades from the northwestern states are going to count the votes or are trying to get the votes. I want especially to ask Comrade Untermann, was the country built up by a voting system or was it built up by a revolutionary system? If those foreigners who are coming to this country have revolutionary ideas, that is no reason for excluding them for the simple reason that they

are lowering the standard of living of the Americans there and that they have no right to vote in this country. But I will not say they have a right to start a revolution in this country when they are trying to advance the great social revolutionary movement. As a matter of information for the comrades here I would state that the politicians have pretty near the same idea as the chairman of the committee presenting the majority report has. They have come to the conclusion that the foreigners have not got the right to vote, and a good many have not, for the simple reason that they are not able to learn and speak the English language. And what if they do not? I have a good many examples, especially on the north side of Pittsburgh, where they have made citizens from foreigners who were not five years in this country, in order to get their votes. At the last municipal election I succeeded in converting some of those foreigners who are citizens, and they have voted the Socialist ticket in the city of Pittsburgh. To my surprise, on election day two of them came to me with ballots ready and asked me to help them to vote. I said, "I wonder; you are citizens of this country and do not know how to vote?" They said, "Well, we can't read this paper, and we don't know where to put our crosses." I simply told them, "You put the cross in the Socialist ticket and then you will have the right vote." Now, what does that prove? It proves that the politicians know that they are poor foreigners in this country and they are trying to exploit the foreigner for their purposes, and we, as Socialists, supposed to be class conscious, we do not know how to start with the foreigners or what to do with them. Instead of losing two days here over the subject of immigration, wouldn't it be better if we had sent out literature in the different foreign languages and explained the situation to the foreigners, and then they would be in the ranks with us and be voting our platform and fighting for the betterment of our condition. I have a paper before me, a Polish Socialist weekly, the Polish Laborer, issued in the City of New York, dated May 12. In that paper there is correspondence from San Francisco showing that five Mexicans and fifteen Chinese comrades have started a Socialist club in San Francisco, and that club

is rapidly growing and at the present time has 150 members in the party. (Applause.) Now, you remember the majority report where they say it is the yellow race that is going to take our bread in this country. You do not know how to start the agitation to get the foreigners in your party, and that is your bitter cry, that you want to keep them from competing. We have heard a good many remarks on that proposition; especially Comrade Hunter explained to us that there was a time when the Irishmen had to fight the Americans, and the Germans organized against the Irishmen, and so on. I will give you another instance, Comrade Untermann, of how the non-political reactionary anarchists, I. W. W., working at McKees Rocks, succeeded in organizing about 3,000 foreigners in the Industrial Workers of the World, but they have not succeeded in getting a single American into the organization, for the simple reason that the capitalist press are taking up the same cry as some of our comrades do. There was a strike in Newcastle at the American Sheet and Tin Plate Works. The Amalgamated Association of sheet and tin plate workers struck against the corporation, and the trust papers have published accounts about the foreigners coming in, and this talk about America for the Americans is simply proving to the Americans that you are determined to fight the foreign element of this country and exclude them from the shores of America. The workers in the I. W. W. in McKees Rocks were discharged from the works because they had tried to organize their brothers. Besides, the company did not live up to their agreement and they decided to go on a strike, and a few hundred Americans acted as state deputies to protect the Americans who scabbed on the brothers in the Pressed Steel Car Company. The result was that we had trouble in McKees Rocks. Some of the men were arrested and some of the people are still in jail, and the strike was lost. Was the strike lost on account of the foreign peril in this country, or was the strike lost on account of the fact that the Americans in McKees Rocks especially do not understand anything of the class consciousness and solidarity of the working men?

They are simply confronted by the peril of the yellow race in the western states, but they do not see the peril

of the foreign races in the eastern states. Anyhow, you comrades have not heard the bitter cry of the comrades in the State of Pennsylvania. As far as the comrades of Pennsylvania are concerned, they have heard it, and they are revolutionists in the position they take on the immigration question. Instead of crying out about the yellow peril in the southern and western states or the foreigners in the industrial centers of this country, I would say to the Socialist Party, send out your organizers in these languages and you will get the Koreans and Hindoos and Japs into the party as comrades. If you want to vote for brotherhood, then you will simply accept the substitute of Comrade Hillquit.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): I wish to preface my remarks with two propositions. The first point is that I shall not make a partisan speech on any subject before the house; and, in the second place, I wish to say that I will take my point of departure from the recognized fundamental principles of international Socialism, namely, the class struggle.

As a text for the presentation and consideration of the matters which I wish to place before you I shall take the minority report. And I want to say now in order that you may be prepared for my argument and not spring it on you 'at the close, that if all of these motions were voted down today, I would move that the committee be continued or changed or a new committee put up in its place, and that expert and scientific investigation be given to the whole problem of immigration, and the particular problem of Asiatic immigration, and that the findings of such an expert investigating committee be presented in written form, not only for the use of the unenlightened Socialist comrades of America on this question, but for the information of the International Socialist movement at Copenhagen or wherever it shall meet. I submit, comrades, that this question of continuous Asiatic or any other immigration into the United States of America is too great a question to be hastily acted upon by the unenlightened minds of this body. I have talked personally to fifty people on this floor on this Asiatic question, and I think I can find you fifty delegates in this congress that have not read even a single pamphlet on the question of Asiatic immigration, and

they are to voice the sentiment of the Socialist movement of America, and they are going to advise the International Socialist movement of the world as to their findings. I submit that you are not capable of doing it until you have made more scientific investigation of this question. And that is not an accusation against the intelligence of this body. This is probably the most intelligent, or as highly intelligent a body of Socialists as can be assembled in America. But speaker after speaker has stood upon this platform with arms up and nothing to say, except glittering generalities. Is that not the fact, comrades? They have given us confusion here. I do not know how to vote or how to speak. On this platform, Comrade Wanhope has confessed that he does not know how to vote. Comrade Hillquit's resolution simply restates the resolution of the International Congress at Stuttgart. We do not come here to re-enact international propositions adopted at Stuttgart. We come here to deal with the specific problems arising out of the application of the resolution adopted at Stuttgart. We did not need to cross the continent to re-enact that. We can all read it. But we are dealing here with a practical issue; with facts. I submit that Comrade Hillquit's resolution offers us nothing. This country has been open as an asylum and a hospital for the oppressed people of the world for decades. It did not need this resolution to bring that about. This is not a question of asylum for the oppressed of the earth; this is a question of a mass of laborers imposed upon the class struggle in America. That is the issue I submit.

I said I was going to take Comrade Spargo's report as my text for the consideration of this class struggle. But I am not partisan on this. I feel sure that I have the confidence of the delegates on that matter.

Now let us take this fundamental position of the class struggle: Workmen of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have the world to win. I ask you now, comrades, whether it is the province of the International Socialist movement of the world working in concert with the organized labor of the world to determine—mark this sentence—this is the crux of the whole proposition—whether it is not the province of the International Socialist

movement of the world and the Socialist Party of America and the organized workers of the world and the organized workers of America—listen now—whether it is not our province to determine the conditions under which the class struggle shall be carried on, or shall we permit the capitalists to gather up our comrades from every corner of the world and thrust them on us to fight them, and under conditions which will hinder or prevent us from fighting the class struggle? Let a great strike break out in this city today in the building trades. The capitalists will flood this continent with advertisements and demands for builders. What will you do? The international delegates of this conference, and this conference, and the organized labor of Chicago will give notice to the laboring men of America to keep away from Chicago. Why? Because you reserve to yourselves the right to determine the conditions under which the class struggle shall be fought. But you don't want that in this instance. No. Under the cover of glittering phrases, you would permit capitalism under its black flag to delude and betray our comrades east and west and north and south from the Danube to the Ganges, and put them down at your very back doors, and say: "You will fight these men where we put them and not where you wish them to be." The Socialist movement of the world is not asking immigrants to come here. The Socialist movement of Europe is not asking immigrants to come here; the working class of the world today are seeking to get in touch with each other to prevent this unnatural migration of their brothers.

We were told that there were a lot of Chinamen organized into a Socialist club. Ridiculous. Ridiculous. We want this class struggle; we want it organized; we want it organized under the administration of the Socialist Party. If we cannot get that we want it organized in the trades union movement of the world, and we will be compelled to work with it. But we want it organized. And therefore we say that we should not permit the black flag of capitalism to seize the ships of the two great seas and gather to our shores, as they will, the multitudes of our brothers of the Orient and say that we shall fight, not capitalism, but our brothers thus imported.

Now, comrades, I am speaking with

deliberation although with some feeling. This subject is not made on the floor of this congress. Comrade Spargo, you will listen to me; I listened to you. I admired many of the things that you said. I would not take a second place to any man on the floor of this congress in my feeling of solidarity with the lowest and most down-trodden of the human race, wherever he may be. But that is not the question here. When I was in the city of Ottawa, Canada, they imported workers to break a strike, and among those men were men who wore the red button and the Socialist badge. What did we do? We went to them, or we sent them back, and if they had not gone we would have sent them elsewhere. That is the class struggle. The class struggle is not a phrase. It is a fact. Now, I submit to you that the International Programme and the Resolutions of Stuttgart distinctly define the terms "workingmen" and "proletarians" in terms of the capitalistic system of civilization. When the Stuttgart resolution talks about the working class it is talking about it in terms of the capitalistic system. Emigration and immigration are part of the capitalistic system. It talks about proletarian solidarity. The "proletarian" is the product of the capitalistic system and the expression "class struggle" is speaking in the terms of that struggle.

Now I wish to call attention to the fact that every recommendation of the International Committee is a recommendation in terms of trade union action, in terms of Socialist action; a thing that is impossible in the Orient. And I submit to you that the importation of vast multitudes of immigrants has created a tool for the capitalist class to use; and, in the next place, this importation places these multitudes in a place where they cannot effectively share in the proletarian struggle. But Comrade Spargo then comes to his climax. He says: "We cannot agree with the Stuttgart resolution, but if we find it necessary in the maintenance of the class struggle in America and to maintain the standard of living and the principles of democracy, then he will favor exclusion to any extent that may be necessary." He says also that the importation of slave labor would be a betrayal of every ideal and principle of Socialism. I say to you, comrades, that that

emergency is upon us. This nation is wrestling with race problems now; it has the colored problem; it has the Mexican problem; and on the coast it has reached almost the point of physical outbreak. Why? Because organized labor in America, and the Socialist Party up to date have permitted the capitalist class of the world to determine when and how they shall flood your precincts with your brothers from all over the world and make them fight this class struggle to the advantage

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Seidel called the congress to order at two o'clock P. M. Credentials were presented from Casimir Kokos, representing the Lithuanian Socialist Federation of America, and on motion the delegate was admitted as a fraternal delegate and given a seat in the congress.

THE CHAIRMAN: An arrangement has been made as to the remaining speakers, being the comrades who have reported the various reports and also the substitute and amendment and other motions. The arrangement of speakers is to be as follows: Lee, Hillquit, Spargo, Untermann. Lee will have five minutes, Hillquit ten minutes, Spargo thirty minutes, and Untermann thirty minutes.

Several points of order were made as to the arrangement as to the time of the speakers, but the program was carried out as announced by the Chairman, after personal explanations by Delegate Spargo.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): In my opinion any man who approaches this question and who has gone through this discussion fairly cannot believe that any one of the motions which have been made was made for any other purpose than to bring definitely before this congress the meaning, the opinion of the maker or makers of the motion or motions. (Applause.) And in my opinion any man who insinuates otherwise and then attempts by parliamentary obstruction to prevent a reply to his accusation does not act in the spirit of a Social Democrat. (Applause.)

The Chairman admonished Delegate Lee to refrain from personalities.

DEL. LEE: I do not consider that a personality, but I have said what I had to say on that subject. I have introduced an amendment to Comrade

of the capitalist class and to the destruction of our own class, throughout the world. That is the reason for it.

At this point an adjournment was taken until 2 P. M.

GROUP PHOTOGRAPH.

On Wednesday after the noon adjournment a photograph of the members of the congress in a group was taken at the entrance to the Public Library.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Hillquit's substitute motion. I have introduced it for this reason: The majority report declares the congress in favor of the exclusion of Asiatic labor, but it is not to me altogether satisfactory, although I am in favor of that point. The minority report commits this congress to the exclusion of Asiatics in principle, but leaves it in the air and says that we should not apply this principle, as there is no Asiatic question. Delegate Hillquit's amendment states in effect the Stuttgart position, and I have desired an amendment to express my opinion as I expressed it at Stuttgart, and this expression in spirit copies the Stuttgart resolution, that Asiatic immigration into this country under existing circumstances at the present time is a mass importation of labor by the capitalist class for the benefit of the capitalist class and against the working class. (Applause.) And those of you who agree with me on that proposition and are not satisfied with the majority report have your opportunity to vote with me. I think you will be for the minority; I think you should be for the minority, but I have desired and do desire to see a definite declaration upon that question, and for that reason I asked that I be allowed twenty minutes, not five minutes, and for the reason that I stated before, I absolutely refused to yield those five minutes when it was demanded in the way it was.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): Before proceeding I want to ask the seconders of my motion or substitute whether they will consent to the substitution of the word "importation" for "immigration" in the phrase "the mass immigration of workers from foreign countries," so that it shall read "the

mass importation of workers from foreign countries." I hear no objection on the part of my seconders, and I will ask the congress to consider my substitute with that change.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): Now come to the last part of the second clause.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I will come to that, Comrade Morgan. With the change it will read as follows, and I will read the entire substitute to you now in its final wording: "The Socialist Party of the United States favors all legislative measures tending to prevent the immigration of strike breakers and contract laborers and the mass importation of workers from foreign countries brought about by the employing classes for the purpose of weakening the organization of American labor and lowering the standard of life of American workers. The party is opposed to the exclusion of any immigrants on account of their race or nationality, and demands that the United States be at all times maintained as a free asylum for all men and women persecuted in their countries on account of their politics, religion or race."

Now, comrades, I am not going to make any argument in support of the substitute at this time. The only object in my taking the floor at this time was to clear up my position and to remove certain misunderstandings. I will say to you now, lest it be misinterpreted later on, that I intend by this substitute to lay before you the substance of the Stuttgart resolution; that this substitute is not to be interpreted as meaning anything else but what the Stuttgart resolution has expressly declared. And I will call your attention to the fact that almost all the wording of it is bodily taken from the Stuttgart resolution. The International Socialist Congress recognizes all three classes of exclusion which we embody in this substitute; first, strike breakers; second, contract laborers; third, mass importation of foreign workers brought about by employers of labor for the purpose of destroying the organizations of American labor or lowering the standard of life. And I will call your attention to the fact that the second clause is as broad as we can make it, Comrade Morgan to the contrary notwithstanding. If it consisted merely of the last clause demanding that the United States be maintained as an asylum for those persecuted at

home, his criticism might have been justified. But Comrade Morgan ought to read the preceding clause, which says that the party is opposed to the exclusion of any immigrants on account of their race or nationality. Now, you cannot make it broader.

I do not consider that this question before us is of such tremendous importance, overshadowing everything else before us. It is of tremendous interest, but not of tremendous importance. I think at the same time that no matter what resolution we adopt today, the lines and issues should be drawn clearly and the vote should be taken accordingly. And I repeat again that I do not want anyone to vote under a misapprehension. Some comrades, and very good friends of mine, too, made the charge openly that this substitute is a cover, a respectable cover for the majority report. The members of the committee who brought in that report do not think so, and if there is any one who can so unnaturally construe it, I want to repeat and reiterate now that if this substitute is adopted it is one opposed to the majority report.

Now, I have absolutely nothing to do with Comrade Lee's amendment. I have a good deal to do with the author of the amendment. Comrade Lee himself is a very warm personal friend of mine, but I will vote against his amendment, and I think his amendment would absolutely defeat the object of my substitute. I shall vote against the majority report because I think it is wrong in principle—the exclusion of Asiatic races as races. True enough, they say they are to be excluded not as races per se, but they go on and describe the reasons why they should be excluded, and those reasons are reasons describing the condition of a certain race as a race and nothing else.

I am opposed to Comrade Spargo's minority report, although again I repeat that I am not opposed to Comrade Spargo. But I am very violently opposed to his minority report, for it stands for the principle of exclusion of races. No matter how well Comrade Spargo argues to the contrary, his resolution says in distinct terms not capable of misunderstanding, "We cannot agree that such exclusion, if determined upon, would be in conflict with the principle of proletarian solidarity." And further, "We affirm,

in opposition to this declaration, that the central, fundamental principle of Socialism is the class struggle, and that it is the duty of the Socialist movement to fight the battle of the working class for higher standards of living, and to protect at all costs the measure of civilization we have attained, against the capitalist forces which menace it." And those forces are specifically stated as being, or possibly being, certain races. Now, I say his position may be sound, but in principle it is the position of the majority. It is absolutely the same except that Comrade Spargo makes the same gratuitous additional statement that today there is no occasion for applying that principle. Therefore, I say that those standing against the exclusion of races have no alternative other than the substitute before them.

Now, comrades, I will say to you frankly that there was a time when I took Comrade Untermann's position on the subject. But I was taught differently at the last international congress. I there, after a full debate, being overruled practically by every nation in the world, pledged solemnly that I would hereafter defend the international position, and it is in furtherance of that pledge and in absolute good faith, I want you to understand, that this substitute is offered before you today. (Applause.)

Now, it is said that it is not specific enough. Perhaps it is not, but that is a merit rather than a demerit, and strengthens rather than weakens it. We are not called upon today to apply our principles, our views on a problem in a direct, practical manner to any specific state of facts; we are asked for a declaration of principles.

Our non-English speaking immigrants, one-fourth of our membership, with thousands and thousands still to be organized, ask us, "How do you stand on the question of immigration?" Organized labor asks the same question. You answer, not by a reference for further study, but you answer in the words of the substitute as follows: "We will protect the working class in their class struggle, but we will not at any time engage in a race struggle." (Applause.)

COM. SPARGO: I said yesterday that it did not seem to me worth while to discuss a question of this magnitude by referring to incidental and possibly accidental cases which one might have

gleaned in his study. I am still of that opinion. You can tell me that here in some specific battle the white worker has been less of a fighter than the yellow worker. You can possibly quote instances similar with reference to the conflict between the black worker and the white worker. And when you have done it all you have not proved anything at all.

I am, however, tempted at this very beginning to remind the comrades here that although the immigration problem is uniquely an American problem, that it is still not exclusively a problem belonging to this nation. It is but recently that in Hawaii there was a tremendous strike upon the sugar plantations. That strike in Hawaii, part of that class struggle to which we pledge ourselves, was led and organized and carried on by Japanese workers, and the result of that conflict in Hawaii has been that Mr. Houghton, the largest capitalist in Honolulu, came direct from Honolulu and was interviewed by the press of the country and gave out this statement: "The only menace to the future prosperity of Hawaii is the trouble made by the Japanese in their labor organizations. The time has come," he said, "when in the interest of the peaceful development of Hawaii we must send back every Jap and put a white man in his place." And that interview, that statement by Mr. Houghton, given to the Baltimore American and given to other large newspapers of the country, is thoroughly representative today of the attitude of capital in that section upon this question of immigration. They too have an immigration problem, but they want to send back the Jap because he is too good a fighter for his class, and they want to import the white man because he will not fight at all.

Now then, we have been asked to discuss the question without oratorical flights. I am sorry that it is not possible for me to hold in, in my statement of my own case, but so far as I can do so I shall without passion ask you to consider as well as we may in the time at our disposal each of the propositions at present before this congress. And for reasons of personal convenience only I ask first your attention to the amendment to the substitute offered by Comrade Lee. I do not think much can be said in a Socialist congress in support of that amendment to the substitute. It was not

merely a confirmation of the practical attitude taken upon the question by the majority. It was far more than that, far more of a menace to the working class of every country.

Comrade Lee's position logically, as I grant, excludes the question of race. He places it entirely upon the basis of economic competition. It is because of the economic competition that Comrade Lee would exclude them, and I say to you, Comrade Lee, your dissertation upon logic yesterday was, I have no doubt, very helpful, but the question before us is not one of logic; we care not here to write text books upon logic, nor to listen to learned dissertations upon logic. I ask you to face the fact.

Not that I taunt you with being illogical; I taunt you rather with having first laid down your principle and then said, "That principle being of paramount importance, the standard of living of our workers being menaced by alien competition, we must protect that standard of living," and then, instead of beginning to protect that standard of living by excluding the people most dangerous in the economic field, you exclude the people, of all who come to this shore, the least dangerous to our standard of living. And I say to you, comrades of the foreign nationalities, don't you mistake the fact that if that amendment to the substitute is adopted here today it is but a thinly veiled attack upon you and upon the races that you represent. (Applause.)

Comrade Lee reaches the race question by a circuitous route. He says he does not exclude the Jap as a Jap, he excludes him because of his "menace to our standard of living," and he is attacking the Jap for a very slight competition, if any at all, and leaving untouched the races which do more or less seriously enter into it.

I take Comrade Hillquit's substitute, and I say to you frankly that if there had been an opportunity to do so I am satisfied that possibly Comrade Hillquit and myself could have agreed. But the substitute as it stands before you is not, Comrade Hillquit to the contrary notwithstanding—at any rate, in my judgment it is not a confirmation of the essentials of the Stuttgart resolution. If you accept Comrade Hillquit's substitute you are not accepting the Stuttgart resolution. He has taken the Stuttgart resolution and has emasculated it; he has boiled it down until it

comes to us as a very much attenuated thing. And what is it that he has left out of the Stuttgart resolution which I believe to be most vital? Why, the program in that resolution, the constructive side of that program, saying to the workers of the world, "Here and now, at this time and in the near future that we can forecast, exclusion is not the remedy. Go and organize. If you fear foreign competition, if you fear that your standards of life are to be lowered, then the thing to do is to carry out a program of municipal and national reform, to carry it out through measures protecting the public health." In other words, instead of resorting to that which all of us say we would consent to as a last resort, Comrade Hillquit accepts merely a declaration which means that we shall sit down and do nothing at all.

There is an issue between the majority and minority reports. The majority report, as you know, takes this position: In its practical outcome it pledges the American Socialists here and now to proceed with the advocacy of Asiatic exclusion; here and now it pledges American Socialists to Asiatic exclusion. It specifically in its text repudiates the idea, repudiates the suggestion that it is based upon race hatred. And the argument for it in the main has not been an argument upon a race basis on its face. Most of the delegates have argued that the Jap is a menace to our standards of living. Other of the delegates speaking for the majority report have frankly confessed that that in their judgment is not the fact, and that in the last analysis their position was one of racial antagonism and antipathy. The text of the majority report says that it is not race discrimination, but the argument for the report says it is not merely race, it is race plus environment, and not even the dialectical skill of my good Comrade Untermann will, I think, be able to make clear to you how you can distinguish and differentiate the environment of the race. The environment of a race is part of that race life, and you cannot get away from it.

Now, that is my position here, very briefly stated, in opposition to the majority report. I am satisfied with everything in that Stuttgart resolution except this: that it enacts a thing binding upon Socialists for all time, that if ever it became necessary to exclude a race—not the Japs particularly—if it

ever became necessary to exclude any race, you should be betraying the Socialist movement by so doing.

I cannot accept that as a matter of Socialist theory. It may become of the utmost importance in the practical development of this movement, and I cannot subscribe to an enactment like that; and I say as I have said before, from this platform during this congress, if the occasion should ever arise in the life of this nation when it became necessary, then, having tried every other method—and it would not be necessary until every other method had been tried—then quite regrettably I should have to say, sad as the case is, it must be so, and though it were my blood brother I should have to vote to exclude him. Now, that is the difference, which is not an unessential difference, as represented by some of the speakers. I do not know whether, if ever at all, such an occasion will arise. I do not anticipate that it will arise in the lifetime of any Socialist here present. I do not believe that there is the slightest reason to suppose that we shall have such a problem upon our hands.

The majority says the problem is here now. I say the problem is not here now. The majority says we must forthwith exclude the Asiatic, and I say that here and now we need not exclude the Asiatic; we need not exclude the Greek, the Russian, the Slav; we need not exclude any single worker from any part of the world who comes of his own volition as a free man. If they say that that is a slight difference between the majority and the minority, they are welcome to use language as carelessly as that if they will.

I shall from this point proceed to substantiate, so far as I may, my contention that there is not now such a problem nor such a necessity. But in passing let me say that I have listened in this congress with deep heart pangs to many of the speeches that have been made. If they had been made in a Democratic convention I should have hissed them as being unworthy. (Applause.)

I stand with Comrade London, protesting that we need not here and now violate the decalogue. We are not driven to that extreme. If it comes to a point where I must kill my brother in order to live, I shall kill my brother to live, but I am not going out of my way to kill my brother. And that

decalogue, as Comrade London called it, is an international one; that feeling of world brotherhood is not to me merely a phrase, comrades.

I heard my Comrade Hunter—and I heard him with surprise, heard him with indignation, heard him with sorrow for his own sake—call all sentiment about internationalism, about world brotherhood, mere bosh for the protection of capitalism. (Applause.) Do you believe that when we go out into the world proclaiming international solidarity that the capitalist class dances with joy? Not at all. Whenever that word "internationalism" is spoken capitalism trembles and feels the approach of its doom. Do you anticipate that when you sang the "Red Flag" last night it was an expression of mere bosh and that the capitalists of Chicago were inspiring your music? Do you think that the capitalists of this country are going to teach our children to sing the "Red Flag," and the "International?" Not upon your life, comrades, not upon your life. (Applause.)

And Comrade Gaylord—no, I will not follow Comrade Gaylord to that depth. There was not in Comrade Gaylord's speech a word that was in any sense at all an expression of the sentiment of the international Socialist movement. (Applause.)

Now, let us go back to the problem we have. Much has been said of the Japs, and the official figures may be disputed. I am perfectly willing to permit you to dispute them. I am perfectly willing that you should treble the figures to account for any discrepancy if you please. Multiply them ten times if you will, and what do they amount to? Last year there were 3,275 Japs, just enough to make a township out upon the prairie, just enough to be lost in the shuffle in this great city of Chicago. Multiply the number ten times, Comrade Gaylord, and you have got just enough to elect a dog catcher even in Milwaukee. (Laughter.)

And then we are told that the Korean is a real menace. It is not actually the Jap, it is the Korean. Eleven Koreans came into the United States last year. (Laughter.) Multiply the eleven of the official statistics a thousand times, and the Korean problem does not exist yet, my comrades.

The Hindoo, 337 of him are reported. Suppose you multiply it ten times, and you have not got a problem yet. All your oriental laborers heaped together

made 5,464 men. Multiply that five times, ten times, twenty times, or one hundred times, and where are you then? It is still, in this nation of ninety millions, it is still in this great crucible, even if you admit that it is all dross, it is a very tiny bit of dross in that great crucible of ninety millions.

I stand here upon this basis, comrades. I am not afraid to say what I will do in the great Kalends. I am not afraid to say what position I would take when the situation confronts us. But here and now there is no Asiatic problem before the American people. As regards the Asiatics, let us see. There were 165,248 that came from southern Italy alone. There were 77,565 Poles. These are only some of the figures. You of the western slope, you who say you represent the western slope, let me say that California, by a state referendum, repudiated your position two years ago, Comrade Maynard. You say you represent the Pacific slope, and the telegram read here from Portland, says that your poor, broken down blanket stiff welcomes the Jap and will not exclude him. (Applause.) You who say you represent the Pacific slope, you have painted up a picture terrible in its blackness, but it does not begin to compare with the picture your own supporters have drawn of the conditions from Southern Italy.

The significant thing in the whole debate has been that the people who have spoken for Asiatic exclusion have mainly argued for the exclusion of immigrants from every nation. (Applause.) When Comrade Hunter pictured his tragic experiences in the Stock Yards as a settlement and associate worker in the City of Chicago, he was not picturing the menace of the Jap, he was picturing the menace of the Slav, the menace of the Italian, the menace of the Croatian; not the menace of the Orient, but the menace of the Balkan Peninsula. That is the situation, comrades. (Applause.)

Now, listen; we are told that there is another reason; it is because the Japanese civilization is so much lower than ours, and Japanese morals, if you please, have been arraigned in a Socialist congress in Chicago, of all places in the world. (Laughter.) Japan, they say, is centuries behind, centuries behind in its industrial development. But, comrades, that is not true. Japan and China are centuries behind the in-

ustrial development of the United States, I grant you. They are not centuries behind the capitalist development of the Balkan Peninsula and the Russian Steppe or Sicily, or the other places from which we are drawing the vast proportion of our immigrant population of today. (Applause.)

Let us state the facts. If you tell me that Japan's civilization is lower than ours, if you tell me that they are lower in that upward climb from beast to brother, I tell you no. And I point you to the fact that even America, when she wants to understand progress in modern hygiene, in modern medicine, in modern surgery, she sends her best men to study from the despised Japs. Take the death rate of the Japanese soldiers in the great conflicts with China and Russia. Take the death rate of the American soldiers in the Philippines. Take the reports prepared by the experts. Take the attitude of the Japanese Imperial government upon all questions of hygiene and progress, and then tell me, if you dare, that boss-ridden, corrupt, ignorant Chicago is one whit more advanced than Tokio in Japan. (Applause.) I repeat, comrades, you may claim if you will in the face of the facts that Japanese civilization and progress in the humanities has been less than ours; but when you attempt to tell me that Japan is centuries behind these other nations that you fear, I tell you it is not true. Come with me, if you can, in imagination to Tokio in Japan, and you will find right there in that great important Japanese center a Japanese plant of the Standard Oil Company, made by Japanese labor and carried on by Japanese labor. Go with me to the inland sea of Japan, and what will you find? A great plant of the Standard Oil, one of its finest plants in the world, built from American pressed steel, but you will find another plant being raised, built from pressed steel made in Japan and not in America. Go with me, if you will, 700 miles south of Pekin to Hankou, and there you will find a great steel plant employing a total of 20,000 men who are going to meet you in the labor markets of the world, no matter what you say. You can draw laws against the men and keep them out. You can put policemen at every linear yard of your boundary line, but you cannot build a wall high enough that will keep the products out of the labor markets of the world. (Applause.)

Ah, has capitalism touched China? Yes, and capitalism touches everywhere in this vast earth of ours.

Comrades, I must pause from this argument, to ask you to think of the gigantic consequences of the adoption of the majority report. This question comes before us as a party. We of the Socialist Party who are feeling its pulse, knowing that we live in a nation with a foreign speaking proletariat, knowing that if ever the battle of labor is to be won in this country it must be won by the foreign speaking immigrants—(applause)—we have known that their hearts are quickened, we have known that they have been uneasy, we have felt in our foreign speaking organizations the fear of what would happen tomorrow if you are permitted to drive the entering wedge today. And I tell you, if you want to bankrupt certainly Socialism in America you can do it by adopting the majority report. I am not afraid to say that I am old-fashioned. I am not afraid to say that I still stand by old watchwords, by old ties, by old sentiments. Socialism is, after all, Comrade Gaylord, something more than the electing of mayors or aldermen. If I wanted office, if I wanted to barter Socialism for a mess of pottage, I would get a bigger mess of pottage than that. If you want to elect mayors only, you can do it. If you want to elect governors only, you can do it. I say to you that while it may be true that my great-great-grandchildren may be forced to the necessity of raising their hands against the hands of their brothers, for myself I will not. You can tell me it is bosh if you will. You can say that the capitalists want it if you will. But I know better, and I know that the heart of this Socialist movement is that red bond of human blood and common aspiration that binds me to my brother in this great world struggle. (Applause.)

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): Before I go to the very meat of this question, permit me to take up first the side issues which have been raised upon the floor of this congress. Every speaker of the opposition has come to this platform stating that he liked neither Comrade Lee's substitute for the substitute nor Comrade Hillquit's substitute, nor Comrade Spargo's minority report, nor the majority report, and that really they had not made up their minds and did not know any-

thing about the question, and yet they argued for hours as though they knew the question. A whole lot of them came up here and made you believe we were opposed to the international solidarity of the working class. They made you believe that because we demanded present day action under circumstances in which international solidarity was not possible, that therefore we were opposed to the principle of international solidarity. What we said was this: If international solidarity is used as a phrase that helps the capitalist and not the working class, then we are opposed to it.

Comrade Fraenckel of Chicago declared to you that he was a revolutionary Socialist and believed in international solidarity, and to prove how revolutionary a Socialist he was, and how much he loved solidarity, he declared that if the majority of the revolutionary Socialists of this country should adopt a policy that worked towards international solidarity in a way that he did not like, he would try to split the Socialist Party.

DEL. FRAENCKEL: That is not so.

DEL. UNTERMANN: He says that is not so. I refer to the stenographic report.

DEL. FRAENCKEL: I did not say that.

DEL. UNTERMANN: Another comrade got up here and tried to make capital out of the fact that he had been a blanket stiff. My friends, if any one has been in the abyss, if any one has been through the abyss, it is Comrade Wanhope, it is Comrade Guy Miller, and it is myself. We are not professors far away from the daily lives of the working class. We have been standing away down in the abyss, living the life of the proletarian. I have carried the blanket over twenty feet of snow on snowshoes, and I do not need any pointers from Comrade Tom Lewis on the life of the blanket stiff.

The comrades allied with the I. W. W. engineered their opposition very cleverly. Just at the right psychological moment a telegram arrived and a little further on you were told all of a sudden that a Socialist Party local of Chinamen had been organized in the city of San Francisco, and it was said that the I. W. W. represented the true working class movement and that the Socialists would have to come to them. Now, let me tell you first a little about

that Chinese local and about the I. W. W., since that point has been raised. We helped the I. W. W. in its fight for free speech in Spokane and for working class power on the coast. Our speakers went up and down the coast to collect money from the American Federation of Labor for the I. W. W., because we believed in the principle of free speech and because we wanted to help the I. W. W.; not because we were pledged to do it, but because they were working men fighting for better conditions of life, and so we helped them.

And yet while our speakers were collecting money and begging the trade unions of this country for money to help the I. W. W., the fighters from the I. W. W. were on the outside of our meetings and knocking our meetings. While they were organizing the bogus Chinese local in San Francisco they sent their fighters over to Local Oakland, right across the bay, with the avowed purpose of breaking up that local and destroying the activity of the Socialist Party. The Chinese Local in San Francisco is a bogus local and will decline just as the activity of the I. W. W. today represents the activity of a declining and disintegrating movement, just as the Knights of Labor and the S. L. P. did. The I. W. W. has not fulfilled the mission for which it was originally organized. I have the profoundest respect and sympathy for many of the comrades in that organization, and so far as the principle of industrial unionism is concerned, I stand for it thoroughly in word and deed. But I know that the I. W. W. today is a factor that makes for the disintegration not only of the bona fide labor movement, but also of the Socialist Party; and if the time should come that the present policy of the I. W. W. should become paramount in the unions, it would mean that the whole working class would advocate direct action without political power; it would mean a situation in which the man on horseback would be the man to survive, and that the vast mass of the working people in the United States without political power would leave the power of the man on horseback on the side of the capitalist class and not on the side of the working class. And because I am opposed to that, because I want to unite the working class politically and economically, therefore I say to you that I shall be true to the principle of industrial unionism, but the

I. W. W. can go to hell. (Applause.) Delegate Meyer London was certain that we could not succeed in excluding the Jews, and then he talked for half an hour in order to convince you that if you adopted our exclusion report he was afraid it would exclude the Jews; not only that the Jews would be excluded, but that you would be driven to the logical conclusion of excluding all immigrants; that was his logic.

We have been charged with toadying to the Jews and to the American Federation of Labor. My friends, what does toadying mean? If I made a compliment to somebody in a certain way, it was not intentional. I state facts, and if these facts happen to be a compliment to certain people, and if those people tell me that it is a compliment, I cannot help it.

We are not toadying to the American Federation of Labor. We are scientific investigators charged by the Socialist Party with the analysis of a certain problem, and we have discharged our duty to the Socialist Party as faithfully as we knew how. If Gompers or the American Federation of Labor adopts a policy which is in the interest of the working class, then the Socialist Party will work with them, no matter if we are charged with toadying to them. If the American Federation of Labor and Gompers and Mitchell advocate a policy which is in the interest of the capitalist class, we shall oppose them uncompromisingly. (Applause.)

And that is what we have done here. We have simply stated plainly that in this particular case of Asiatic exclusion the interests of the American Federation of Labor and of the Western Federation of Miners and of the bona fide working class and the remnants of the I. W. W. and the interests of the Socialist Party and of the whole working class of the United States coincide, therefore we could not take any other position than that taken in the majority report, because if we did not take that position we should be advocating a policy which is not to the interest of the Socialist Party.

I have been very much gratified by the way some of my avowed pupils went after me. That is precisely what I had taught them, and I am glad that they are an honor and a credit to me. I have taught them to use their brains and not to believe any man because he says it is so. They differ with me, and

I hope that they will grant to me the same privilege of disagreeing with my European masters. I have been taught by Marx, Engels and Kautsky, but it is now time for the masters to learn from their pupils.

Comrade Spargo said that the Stuttgart resolution and all of that resolution is in the minority report. Just to show you a few logical scraps which were introduced here: They said that if we advocate oriental exclusion we might just as well go to the logical extreme and advocate a high tariff. In other words, this is the logic: Because in the matter of Asiatic exclusion we are opposed to the great capitalist class who favor it, therefore in the matter of high tariff we should work with the great capitalist class whom it benefits. That was the logic advanced to you here. Asiatic exclusion is a matter of interest to the working class. In working for Asiatic exclusion we are working against the interests of the great capitalist class. In working for the high tariff we should be working for the interest of the great capitalist class, and I think that is a difference which a blind man can feel with a stick.

Comrade Spargo told you the docile American scabbed against the imported laborer and revolutionary foreign Socialist. We are dealing with a problem which can be decided only by finding out mass phenomena and not individual instances. Now, if he means to say that the majority of the foreign immigrants are more revolutionary than the majority of the American working men, and that therefore the majority of the Chinese and Japanese are more revolutionary than the majority of the foreign born and native born American citizens—if he means that, he should have said so plainly, and not leave the question in an illogical condition. But he cannot possibly mean it because it is not the fact.

Again, it has been said that if you exclude the Asiatics from the United States and name them specifically, you are introducing a race issue and not a class issue, and you are violating the general principle of international solidarity. In other words, this is their logic: If you say to the working men during a strike or any class struggle, "Stay away from Chicago," then you are fully in line with the international position and are standing for international solidarity; but if you say to

certain races or nations "Stay away from America," then you are violating the principle of international solidarity.

Comrade Kaplan had another argument. He wanted us to be logical. He said that if we demand the exclusion of the Asiatics, no matter on what ground, then we should be logical, and demand that the Englishmen evacuate India and Egypt, etc. That is where the devil has his joke. That is precisely what the Socialists of those countries have been doing. They have said for a generation to the English government, "Evacuate India and give it back to the native Indians; evacuate Egypt and give it back to the native Egyptians." And who is going around the world today giving moral precepts to other people? Teddy Roosevelt. And what does he say about Egypt to the Egyptians? He said they ought to be satisfied to be under English rule. And we say no, the Englishmen ought to get out. And so has the German Socialist Party said, "Get out of Manchuria and give Manchuria back to the Manchurians; get out of Africa and give it back to the natives." And for that reason we say, "Get out of America and give it back to the Americans." (Applause.)

A DELEGATE: Who are the Americans?

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): Who are the Americans, they want to know. They are the people who live here and in other states, the people who have built up this nation for a better chance in the struggle of life. Are we going to give up the splendid fight our forefathers made and voluntarily permit strangers to come and take away our bread? Is this the time for splitting hairs about a question of who are Americans, a question that is absolutely as hard to decide as the question: Who is a Democrat?

Now, we come to the real meat of this question. It has been said that either we must stand absolutely for the exclusion of all foreign immigrants, or if we believe in race exclusion we should definitely say so. And again, others have said that we do say we believe in race exclusion. In other words, one set has one-sidedly emphasized the economic side, another the race side, and whatever argument you can make on either side you must apply logically to all people. That is perfectly true, and no one has said that more clearly than the majority. But

they have not met the main argument of the majority.

Comrade Spargo says we cannot detach race from environment, and he would make you believe that it is the position of the majority that we are trying to detach race from environment. What we have said is that you can not detach race from environment, but we have shown how great are the differences between the environments of the Asiatics and Japanese and those of the Sicilians and Europeans and Greeks. My friends, he has not lived in China. The few facts which he has quoted to you here about Chinese civilization were taken from books. But I have more to show. I have been in China and have lived and worked there, and we know that the Chinese civilization is more than a thousand years behind ours; that India still has its village communes, a primitive stage of communism, and not capitalism; while capitalism in Japan is practically today no further advanced than it was in England 125 to 150 years ago. I quoted to you the export figures and proved to you that while China had only 80 cents per head of exports, and Japan \$8, the United States have \$1,000 per head of exports, showing the vast industrial difference in development between the two countries.

Comrade Spargo admits that there is an unemployed problem, but he says the question of Asiatic immigration is not very imminent today, and he quoted to you some figures to prove that only eleven Koreans came to the United States and only a few hundred Japanese and a few thousand Chinamen, and he wanted you to believe that those figures were correct. The Department of Labor in California states officially that the Chinamen are coming into California, Chinese alone, at the rate of 1,000 a week, smuggled across the frontier by custom house officials themselves.

Comrade Tom Lewis wanted to make you believe that Portland was the best place in the world to study the immigration problem of the Hindoos. I deny it. I challenge him to produce figures to prove that there is one-tenth the Hindoo immigrant labor in Oregon and Washington than we have in California. The telegram from that Portland Local does not prove anything at all about the attitude of the vast masses of the working people on the coast. That is merely one of those

little political moves to influence you. But even suppose Local Portland represented the vast majority of the working men who understood this problem, wouldn't the very telegram prove that they had made up their minds before the evidence was in? Wouldn't it simply be another attempt to prejudice you before you had heard all the evidence? What does it amount to? It is pitiful.

Comrade Spargo quoted against me Comrade Haywood. He said that Comrade Haywood was a practical man, and as a practical man he could prove that Haywood had said that the Japanese and Chinese could be organized. My friends, we have never denied that they could be organized. We do not claim that they are incapable of being organized. It is not a question of whether they are inferior or superior in the matter of organization, but a question of whether they can be assimilated. This problem of immigration on the coast is so imminent and so pressing that the Western Federation of Miners and the American Federation of Labor and all real, bona fide labor organizations are compelled to fight for their lives in order to stave off immigration. The practical man Haywood tells me that the Western Federation of Miners has been fighting for a decade to save itself from ruin through this Asiatic immigration. It has not succeeded in organizing them sufficiently to prevent them breaking down the organization, and he tells me that he is absolutely opposed to the mass importation of Asiatic and Japanese contract laborers.

But the majority report goes farther than that. It says that it is not sufficient to emphasize merely contract labor, because it is impossible to prove the contract labor. Contract labor immigration is certainly not the whole of the immigration.

Now, we come to the question of race plus environment. Why should we emphasize the race? Not as a race per se, as the report says; not because the Chinaman has a slit eye and a yellow skin; not because he wears a blouse and a queue; but because, having lived in an environment which is a thousand years or more behind European civilization, he has certain qualities that make him less easily assimilable than even the lowest European immigrant. It is far easier for us to organize the Sicilian and the Italian and the Greek in the majority of cases

than to organize the Chinese, the Japanese and Koreans and Hindoos, in the course of generations, and that is all we mean to say. All the individual instances that have been quoted prove absolutely nothing, for the only thing I was concerned with was the study of sociology and the observation of mass phenomena.

Comrade Spargo told you that you could not find any cigars made by scab Japanese cigarmakers, but that the American cigarmakers scabbed on the Irish, and the Poles scabbed on the Americans. I challenge that statement. I challenge Comrade Spargo to produce evidence that there is any Japanese labor union of cigarmakers worthy the name in California or any other Japanese labor union organization worthy of that name in California, or anywhere on the coast. On the other hand, I can produce figures and facts which will be corroborated by every authority on this point. There is one set of figures that are very significant, especially with reference to the cigarmakers. There used to be a white cigarmakers' union with several thousand members in the city of San Francisco. Today there are 1,200 Chinese cigarmakers in San Francisco, making scab cigars, working twelve hours a day for \$1, and the native American cigarmakers' union has dwindled away to 200 members. There you have the evidence of the destructive influence of Asiatic immigration upon the American labor unions. These are facts. This is not oratory. And we could quote other facts just as significant in regard to other American labor unions if you want them, and you would find that vast sections of California are now inhabited by Japanese and no longer by Americans, and they are reaching out in every possible way to defeat the American labor unions.

I said to you that it was merely a question of time when they would have our jobs, and all the oratory cannot do away with that one point. If it ever should come to the question of whether I shall have employment or the immigrants of any other race, I desire to tell you that so long as there are American labor unions, and so long as there is an American Socialist Party I am going to see to it that we shall have our jobs and not the other fellow; and I would not care whether the

Chinaman was a Socialist or not. We must have jobs in order to live.

It is true that the development of capitalism would lower the standard of living, even if we had no immigration; you could not get away from that. It is also true that the American capitalist will not be able to withstand the Chinese and Japanese exploitation, and it would make no difference whether the Chinaman came over here or stayed over there, he would not be able to withstand it anyhow. But because the capitalist system lowers the standard of living anyway, is that a reason why we should injure an entire race and make still more unemployed, intensify the unemployed problem still more?

We told you that the admission of those races inevitably tends to produce a race problem rather than a class problem; that it tends to overshadow the class issue. And the opposition told you, as an answer to our argument, that every time a strike occurred in which different nationalities were concerned, that those different nationalities herded together and one race of working people fought against the other, and that in the end even the Socialists of one nationality and the Socialists of another nationality were compelled to fight each other. And yet they say the race issue has nothing to do with it. I disagree, because the herding together of these men proves that whenever they come to a clash in the industrial field, then immediately the race issue springs to the fore, and for that reason we have emphasized also the race side of that question. Right there is a decided difference between the Stuttgart resolution and us. The Stuttgart resolution merely affirms that we should oppose the immigration of contract laborers and the importation of strike breakers. That is not enough, because it does not emphasize the vital difference in the environment of different races. We say there is more difference between us and the Asiatics and Japanese and Koreans and Hindoos than there is between us and strike breakers imported from other countries, especially Europe, and because there is more difference, therefore we want that race difference emphasized, those very essential differences, at this time, so that we can better prepare for the struggle for supremacy between

the working class and the capitalist class.

All over the country the manufacturers have organized and are beginning to have the power to break down the labor unions. Everywhere the cry rises that the labor unions cannot withstand the pressure. Everywhere is there a concerted action on the part of the capitalists to break them down, and at this very crucial moment it is desired to have the Socialist Party take an attitude which will help the capitalists to break down the unions still more; and because that is a fact, I am opposed to it.

I ask you, in the name of the class struggle, in the name of all possible present and future international solidarity, in the name of everything that makes for the victory of the Socialist Party and the victory of the working class, to adopt the majority report. (Applause.)

At the close of the debate, after various points of order had been made, a roll call was demanded and was ordered on Delegate Lee's amendment to the substitute. The roll call was taken the delegates answering as follows:

Alabama—No: C. G. Hutchisson.
Arizona—No: Jos. D. Cannon.
Arkansas—Absent: Stanley J. Clark.
California—Yes: W. Carpenter. No: J. B. Osborne, J. Stitt Wilson, Ernest Untermann, John H. Wilde.
Colorado—No: W. P. Collins, Mila T. Maynard.
Connecticut—Yes: Jasper McLevy. No: Ella Reeves Bloor.
Florida—No: C. C. Allen.
Idaho—No: T. J. Coonrod.
Illinois—No: G. T. Fraenckel, Robert Giese, Adolph Germer, A. M. Lewis, T. J. Morgan, A. W. Nelson, G. A. Peterson, A. M. Simons.
Indiana—No: Jas. Oneal, S. M. Reynolds.
Iowa—Yes: John M. Work. No: J. J. Jacobsen.
Kansas—No: Geo. D. Brewer, Caroline A. Lowe, Kate Richards O'Hare.
Kentucky—No: Walter Lanfersiek.
Louisiana—No: J. W. Barnes.
Maine—No: Grace V. Silver.
Maryland—Absent: W. M. Coleman.
Massachusetts—Yes: Dan A. White. No: James A. DeBell, James F. Carey, Harriet D'Orsay, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr.; Marion Craig Wentworth.
Michigan—No: Frank Altonen, Henry Kummerfeld, J. Hoogerhyde.
Minnesota—No: Morris Kaplan, Leo

Laukki, Mrs. Esther Laukki, J. E. Nash.

Missouri—Yes: E. T. Behrens. No: W. L. Garver, W. W. McAllister.
Montana—No: Geo. W. McDermott.
Nebraska—No: Clyde J. Wright.
Nevada—No: W. H. Burton.
New Hampshire—No: John P. Burke.
New Jersey—No: Max Fackert, Geo. H. Goebel, Frank Hubschmitt, W. B. Killingbeck.

New Mexico—No: C. B. Lane.
New York—Yes: Algernon Lee. No: Jos. Wanhop, Morris Hillquit, W. W. Passage, C. L. Furman, H. Schefer, Park Dills, Gustave Strelbel, Frank Cassidy.

North Dakota—No: Arthur Bassett.
Ohio—No: E. E. Adel, W. H. Miller, E. L. Schnaitt, Marguerite Prevey, John G. Willert, L. A. Zitt.

Oklahoma—No: Oscar Ameringer, Winnie E. Branstetter, J. T. Cumbie, G. W. Davis.

Oregon—No: E. L. Cannon, Tom J. Lewis.

Pennsylvania—No: Jos. E. Cohen, Fred H. Merrick, Thos. F. Kennedy, Edward Moore, Jas. H. Maurer, Robert B. Ringler, Wm. Adams.

Rhode Island—No: Fred Hurst.
South Dakota—No: E. Francis Atwood.

Tennessee—No: T. H. Haines.
Texas—No: W. J. Bell, W. W. Buchanan, P. G. Zimmerman.

Utah—Absent: W. Thurston Brown.
Washington—No: Mrs. E. D. Cory, W. H. Waynick.

West Virginia—Absent: Harold W. Houston.

Wisconsin—No: Victor L. Berger, W. R. Gaylord, Emil Siedel, Carl D. Thompson.

Wyoming—No: W. L. O'Neil, John Heckala.

Delaware—No: J. Frank Smith.
Georgia—No: Paul Hochscheid.

Mississippi—No: S. W. Rose.
North Carolina—No: Rufus J. Morton.

South Carolina—No: A. J. Royal.
Virginia—No: E. B. Slatton.

Summary: Yeas, 6; nays, 99; absent, 3.

During the roll call Delegate Collins desired to state his reason for voting no, but objection was made by various delegates.

The roll call resulted in six ayes and 99 noes, so that the amendment was lost.

The question then came on the substitute offered by Delegate Hillquit, and a roll call was taken, the delegates answering as follows:

Alabama—Yes: C. G. Hutchisson.
Arizona—No: Jos. D. Cannon.

Arkansas—Absent: Stanley J. Clark.
California—No: W. Carpenter, J. B. Osborne, J. Stitt Wilson, Ernest Untermann, John H. Wilde.

Colorado—No: W. P. Collins, Mila T. Maynard.

Connecticut—Yes: Ella Reeves Bloor, Jasper McLevy.

Florida—No: C. C. Allen.
Idaho—No: T. J. Coonrod.

Illinois—Yes: Robert Giese, Adolph Germer, A. M. Lewis, A. W. Nelson, G. A. Peterson, A. M. Simons. No: G. T. Fraenkel, T. J. Morgan.

Indiana—Yes: Jas. Oneal, S. M. Reynolds.

Iowa—Yes: J. J. Jacobsen. No: John M. Work.

Kansas—No: Geo. D. Brewer, Caroline A. Lowe, Kate Richard O'Hare.
Kentucky—No: Walter Lanfersiek.

Louisiana—No: J. W. Barnes.
Maine—Yes: Grace V. Silver.

Maryland—Absent: W. M. Coleman.
Massachusetts—Yes: James A. DeBell, James F. Carey, Harriet D'Orsay, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr., Marion Craig Wentworth, Dan A. White.

Michigan—No: Frank Aaltonen, J. Hoogerhyde. Yes: Henry Kummerfeld.
Minnesota—Yes: Leo Laukki, Mrs. Esther Laukki, J. E. Nash. No: Morris Kaplan.

Missouri—Yes: E. T. Behrens, W. L. Garver, W. W. McAllister.

Montana—No: Geo. W. McDermott.
Nebraska—Yes: Clyde J. Wright.

Nevada—No: W. H. Burton.
New Hampshire—Yes: John P. Burke.

New Jersey—Yes: Geo. H. Goebel, W. B. Killingbeck. No: Max Fackert, Frank Hubschmitt.

New Mexico—Yes: C. B. Lane.
New York—Yes: Morris Hillquit, W. W. Passage, H. Schefer, Park Dills. No: Jos. Wanhope, Algernon Lee, C. L. Furman, Gustave Strelbel, Frank Cassidy.

North Dakota—Yes: Arthur Bassett.
Ohio—Yes: E. E. Adel, Marguerite Prevey, L. A. Zitt. No: W. H. Miller, E. L. Schnaitd, John G. Willert.

Oklahoma—Yes: Oscar Ameringer, J. T. Cumbie. No: Winnie E. Branstetter, G. W. Davis.

Oregon—No: E. L. Cannon, Tom J. Lewis.

Pennsylvania—Yes: Jos. E. Cohen, Thos. F. Kennedy, Robert B. Ringler, No: Fred H. Merrick, Edward Moore, Jas. H. Maurer, Wm. Adams.

Rhode Island—Yes: Fred Hurst.
South Dakota—No: E. Francis Atwood.

Tennessee—No: T. H. Haines.
Texas—Yes: W. W. Buchanan, P. G. Zimmerman. No: W. J. Bell.

Utah—Absent: W. Thurston Brown.
Washington—No: Mrs. E. D. Cory, W. H. Waynick.

West Virginia—Absent: Harold W. Houston.
Wisconsin—Yes: Emil Siedel. No: Victor L. Berger, W. R. Gaylord, Carl D. Thompson.

Wyoming—Yes: John Heckala. No: W. L. O'Neil.

Delaware—No: J. Frank Smith.
Georgia—No: Paul Hochscheid.

Mississippi—Yes: S. W. Rose.
North Carolina—Yes: Rufus J. Morton.

South Carolina—Yes: A. J. Royal.
Virginia—No: E. B. Slatton.

Summary: Yeas, 55; nays, 50; absent, 4.

The roll call on Delegate Hillquit's substitute resulted in a vote of ayes 55, noes 50, and the substitute was declared adopted.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I move that the substitute be sent out to a referendum vote with all the decisions of this congress, in order to be binding. I move to send out also the majority report. I am willing that the majority report and minority report and the substitute shall be sent out. (Seconded.)

Delegate Schnaitd (Ohio) argued against the motion, and Delegate Berger withdrew his motion.

Secretary Barnes announced that Kimball Hall, 243 Wabash Avenue, had been secured for a night session.

DEL. ZITT (Ohio): I wish to move that we hold no evening session. (Seconded.)

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I wish to amend that. I move that the evening session begin this evening at eight o'clock, to take up the resolutions and different reports. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: I have been at about twenty-seven conventions of the Socialist Party, and it has been my experience that all the foolish things and all the hysterical things that have ever

been done were done at night sessions. You are tired out, and you have been sitting here listening closely to all kinds of arguments, and in the evening we must either rest or work through committees. I am against night sessions. It is my experience also in the American Federation of Labor that when you are sleepy you can put through almost anything. I ask you to vote this down.

Delegate DeBell stated that his motion had been made in the interest of time, judging by the slow progress made on the immigration question.

Delegate Burke of New Hampshire moved to amend, that the evening session begin at 7 o'clock instead of eight.

The motion that a night session be held beginning at 8 o'clock was lost.

Delegate Lee, of the Committee on Resolutions, moved that the Committee on Resolutions be given the floor to report so far as they then can, immediately after action has been taken upon the report of the Socialist Woman's Committee. Motion was lost.

The Chairman announced that the hall must be cleared at 5 P. M. and that the Committee on Arrangements had paid down \$25 on account of Kimball Hall for the evening session that had been ordered.

EVENING SESSION.

The congress was called to order at 7:30 by Chairman Seidel.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary states that on the call of the roll there are seventy-eight delegates present. I take it that we have a quorum present under the ordinary practice. What is the sense of the congress?

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I move that we proceed to business.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): I have a motion to offer. My motion is to reconsider the rules in regard to fifteen minute speeches. I hope that I shall get a second.

The motion was seconded by several delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the motion which carried the rule on the subject of limiting speeches to fifteen minutes shall be reconsidered.

The motion to reconsider was declared carried.

DEL. PREVEY: I move that the

Delegate Berger said that while he was opposed to night sessions, inasmuch as the money had been paid and would be lost if the hall was not used, he moved to reconsider the previous action. Carried.

On motion it was decided to hold a night session at Kimball Hall to begin at 7 P. M.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): This is the most outrageously unfair thing I ever heard of. There are about forty delegates to this congress who have left the hall and will never know about this night session at all. I doubt very much whether this motion was in order—the motion to reconsider—as I doubt very much whether the mover of that motion voted in the affirmative on the other motion. I think it is very unfair to hold a session in the absence of so many delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish to correct the delegate. The mover of the motion to reconsider did vote in the majority.

DEL. DE BELL: Yes; he voted in favor of it; that is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is now that when we adjourn we adjourn to this evening at 7 P. M., at Kimball Hall.

The motion was carried.

speeches hereafter be limited to ten minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the rules be so amended that it shall read that speeches shall be limited to ten instead of fifteen minutes.

DEL. O'NEIL: I voted against giving them fifteen minutes when we started this congress, and now when the wind jammers have about worn themselves out and subjects are coming up for discussion in which others are interested it is, proposed to shut them off.

A DELEGATE: Does this include chairmen of committees?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is only to limit the general speeches. The rule as to reporters and chairmen of committees is not changed.

DEL. PREVEY: I do not believe that any delegate to this congress will accuse me of taking advantage of the fifteen minute rule. We realize, however, that under this rule every speaker

that has spoken on any subject has taken his full fifteen minutes, and out of that time five minutes was usually consumed in giving the personal history of the particular delegate. Now, perhaps if we cut it to ten minutes the delegates will leave out the personal reminiscences and give us ten minutes' discussion of the subject before the congress. I believe that all I know about any particular subject that is to come before this congress I can give in ten minutes, after others have expressed themselves. I hope the delegates will remember that even under a ten minute rule it only gives us six speakers to the hour. But we have had only four speakers to the hour heretofore. The delegates are tired, and probably some of those who have made the longest speeches are tired, because they are not with us tonight.

The motion to change the time limit on speeches to ten minutes was then carried.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I move that the hour for adjournment tonight be set at 10:30.

THE CHAIRMAN: The rule adopted for night sessions is that we shall open at 8 P. M. and close at 10 P. M.

DEL. JACOBSEN (Ia.): I have a motion here. I move that the secretary be instructed to insert in the or-

der of business a report of the Committee on Government by Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where does the comrade wish it inserted?

DEL. JACOBSEN: Between F and G.

DEL. BERGER: What is it you are putting it before?

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I understand the chairman of the committee that has been considering this question of government by commission desires to have their report made right after the report of the Committee on Constitution. That is, they desire to have it inserted between J and K. That was the request of Comrade Thompson.

DEL. JACOBSEN: That is correct, I accept that amendment to my motion.

The motion to insert report of Committee on Government by Commission between items J and K was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, I believe that the next order of business is to dispose of the report of the International Delegates.

DEL. BERGER: I move that my report be read last and then both of them disposed of at the same time. They are connected, but mine is the later date.

The secretary then read the reports of the international delegates as follows:

REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

To the National Congress of the Socialist Party.

COMRADES: While the prime object of this Congress is to survey the problems and conditions of the Socialist movement of the United States and to devise effective methods of strengthening our own party, our work would not be complete without at least a brief review of the recent struggles and achievements of our comrades in other countries. Our movement is an organic and inseparable part of the worldwide struggle of the working class for the emancipation of mankind from the thralldom of capital, and its progress and success are largely influenced by the general march of international Socialism.

Only two years have elapsed since I last had the honor of reporting to you the condition of the international Socialist movement, but this short span of time has been exceptionally eventful for our movement. It has witnessed many struggles and some defections, many victories and some repulses, but on the whole it has been marked by a closer drawing of the lines of battle, a distinct step towards the social revolution.

In the countries in which our movement is as yet young and weak, the ruling classes have, as usual, made vain efforts to crush it in the bud by brutal force and cruel persecutions.

In Russia, the triumphant powers of absolutism and reaction indulge in veritable orgies of death and bloodshed. The gallows have taken the place of the "constitution," and the thousands of champions of the cause of liberty, mostly Socialists, are being executed every year without trial or hearing.

In Spain, the first concrete expression of Socialist and workingmen's revolt in recent times took the form of a strong anti-militarist movement. The government had

planned a military expedition against Morocco for the benefit of the capitalists of Spain, but the Spanish workers refused to shed their blood and that of their innocent brothers of Morocco for the profit and pleasure of their masters, and rose in open insurrection against the government. The rising was suppressed and the ruling powers of Spain wreaked terrible vengeance upon the rebellious workers. The culmination of the government's brutalities was the arrest and execution of the noted radical and founder of the "New School" of education, Francisco Ferrer, on September 13, 1909.

In Argentina, the government, through the instrumentality of Chief of Police Ramon Falcon, made the May Day labor parade of 1909 the pretext for a ruthless massacre of the workers. Falcon was subsequently killed by an unknown hand, and his assassination was made the occasion of a series of persecutions unparalleled in point of cruelty in the history of the republic. Martial law was declared for the whole country, the Socialist papers were suppressed, and the party headquarters forcibly closed. Workingmen's libraries were in some instances reduced to ashes, and about six hundred workingmen and Socialists were imprisoned.

In Japan and Roumania, countries so different and distant from each other and yet so similar in the scale of industrial development and the condition of the Socialist movement, our comrades have within the last two years been equally persecuted and harassed by the government.

There is nothing new or alarming in these persecutions for our comrades abroad. They recognize them as a necessary phase in the development of our movement, as a harbinger of progress and gage of victory. The Socialists of Russia are slowly recovering and steadily gathering new strength for another and probably final onslaught on the monster of czardom; the workingmen of Spain have answered the brutalities of this government by electing their first Socialist representative to parliament in the elections just past, and our comrades in Roumania, Argentina and Japan, true to the traditions of the Socialist movement, have gained in numbers and strength under the persecution.

And on the other hand the Socialist workers abroad have within the last two years not been lagging behind their governments in initiating and fighting class wars. In Sweden the Employers' Association, taking advantage of the industrial depression, decided to crush the growing hosts of organized labor. On July 28, 1909, eighty thousand workers were locked out by the concerted action of their employers. Swedish labor answered the attack by a general strike, involving three hundred thousand workers, a majority of all workers of the country! The struggle lasted almost six months, and was epoch making in the history of the Socialist and labor movements of the world. It was the first concrete and undisguised test of strength between the capitalists and workers of any country, a mimic war of the revolution. It ended in a compromise, and neither of the contestants gained substantial material benefits through it. But it served to show that in the most advanced countries labor as a whole may at any time be plunged into the last and decisive battle with the capitalist class—it was a *Mene Tekel Upharsin* for the entire capitalist system. Very extensive labor strikes also occurred in France and Italy, and in all these cases the Socialists were the leading spirits in the struggles. Nor were the battles of Socialism during this period limited to the economic field alone. In Germany our comrades are carrying on a splendid campaign for a radical reform of the monstrous electoral system in Prussia; in Hungary they are making a determined fight for universal suffrage and in most other countries they lead the fight for the full enfranchisement of the people.

Our comrades abroad never quit the armor and they grow and wax strong in the steady struggle. The international army of Socialism has made some mighty advances since our last convention.

In Germany the slight setback of the last parliamentary elections has spurred our comrades to redoubled activity, and their work has borne signal fruit. The trade-unions, which in Germany are closely allied with the Socialists, have more than doubled in numbers within the last few years, and the party itself has marvelously increased in strength. At its last congress, in September, 1909, it reported more than 630,000 enrolled members, and no less than 74 daily papers. In June, 1908, it succeeded for the first time in electing representatives (7 in number) to the Prussian Landtag, and almost every by-election to the Reichstag has been carried by the Socialists.

In France our comrades gained about 300,000 votes and 22 new seats in parliament in the elections which closed this month. In Italy we gained 20 seats in the elections of March, 1909; in Belgium we gained 5 seats in the elections of 1908; in Holland our vote rose from 65,000 to 82,000 in the elections of 1909, and in Finland in the same year our party polled about 40 per cent of the entire popular vote, and elected 84 out of a total of 200 deputies to parliament.

In Australia and New Zealand the scattered Socialist groups have united into one organization and have laid the basis for a strong Socialist party. In the most backward parts of Europe, those of the Balkan peninsula, the Socialist movement has recently made its triumphant entry as a permanent factor. In January, of this year, the Socialists of Servia, Bulgaria, Roumania, Macedonia, Turkey, Croatia, Slavonia, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro met in joint convention, and formed a permanent confederation for the propaganda and struggles of Socialism.

The Socialist movement is rapidly penetrating into every section of the globe, and when the International Socialist congress will assemble at Copenhagen in August of this year, it will be in the true sense of the term a Parliament of Man.

Comrades, that steady and irresistible growth of our movement, its tremendous vitality and vigor, more than any mere theory, offers to the Socialists of the world, and the American Socialists among them, a guaranty of the ultimate triumph of our great cause. Long Live International Socialism!

Fraternally submitted,
MORRIS HILLQUIT.

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SECRETARY.

To the National Committee of the Socialist Party of America.

Greetings:—The annual meeting of the International Bureau was held in the People's Palace, 17 Joseph-Stevens street, 6th to 8th November, 1909.

The Board sat three days. Saturday was taken up by the business of Socialist Journalism; on Sunday the eleventh meeting of the International Socialist Bureau proper took place; and Monday was devoted to the parliamentary commission.

The report of the third conference of Socialist Journalists contained a list of leading Socialist newspapers with the addresses of writers in the various countries who are willing to contribute articles on special subjects. And the first observation I made was that the list from America was meagre indeed. It contained only three names. Camille Huysman, the International Secretary, explained that these were all the names which had been sent to him from America at the time when the bulletin went to press, but that he had received some more names later.

The representatives of the Humanite, comrades Landvieux and Morizet, wanted the meeting to decide as to the kind of advertising which Socialist papers the world over could accept and what they should reject. After some discussion it was decided to leave the discussion of this point to the future.

On Sunday morning the Board considered the time and the order of business for the International Congress which is to meet in Copenhagen in 1910. The Danish comrades proposed a week in September, because they said that at that time it would be easiest to find proper hotel accommodations in Copenhagen. However, this date was opposed by the Germans and the English because party and trades unions congresses are to be held about that time in both England and Germany. So finally the last days of August and the first days of September were agreed upon unanimously.

A long discussion took place on account of the "order of the day" for the next International Congress.

The Co-operative movement is making rapid strides in most of the European countries and some of the delegates wanted the relation of the Co-operative movement to the Socialist movement put upon the order of business. Others contended that the agrarian question should be added.

The Polish delegate, Comrade Diamont, wanted the abolition of capital punishment for political offenses discussed at the congress. Keir Hardie and Quelch proposed a discussion of the eight-hour day, while the Swedish comrade suggested that the question of immediate help, financial aid, to nations where the working class is on a great fight or general strike, should be made an order of the day.

The Bureau finally decided that the next International Congress should be in-

vited to instruct the Bureau to prepare an exhaustive report on the agrarian question for discussion in 1913. Vaillant of France, Molkenbuhr of Germany, Branting of Sweden, Adler of Austria, and your delegate all took the view that the agrarian question differs so much in the various countries that it would be better first to study it in all its phases before the International Bureau took it up.

So at last the order of business was fixed as proposed by the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of America, namely, first, the relation between the parties and the Co-operatives; second, the International results of labor legislation, with the addition that the question of helping Socialist parties in need, should also be taken up.

The question of the abolition of capital punishment for political offenses was declined because the Socialist congress had gone on record against all capital punishment and this was considered sufficient.

On Sunday afternoon resolutions of sympathy to the Spanish workers in their martyrdom, with the Swedish ironworkers, who were still carrying on the general strike—without much financial support from anywhere except from Germany and Austria—and a protest against the violent expulsion of a Socialist comrade from Roumania, were disposed of without discussion.

Comrade Fabrier, who represented Spain, declared that if sufficient financial aid were to be had, the movement in Spain would succeed in winning at least constitutional freedom for that country.

The Bureau then went into executive session in order to take up the difficulty in Holland. A section of the Holland Social-Democracy, the Nieuwe Tyd crowd, had split off on a question of tactics and had formed a new party. The Socialist movement in Holland is weak, the party as a whole having only about six thousand members. The secessionists did not ask for any representation in the Bureau, but they demanded to be recognized as a Socialist party and accorded representation in the International Congress.

Singer of Germany moved that this should be granted. And this was seconded by Vaillant of France.

However, Adler of Austria moved a substitute motion which recommended the parties to patch up their differences, and should they fail, it would be left to the International Congress whether the new party should have representation or not. The motion of Adler was adopted by sixteen to eleven votes. And thus the new party will not be represented at the congress unless it is given representation by the congress itself.

Then the motion of your delegate came up to grant the Socialist party of America both of the two seats in the International Bureau. The chairman of the session, Comrade Vandervelde, was inclined to declare the motion out of order. He claimed that the Bureau had no jurisdiction in this respect and that the matter must be decided by the next International Congress, or, more correctly, by the American delegates at that congress.

However, your delegate took the floor. He explained in a few words that the Socialist Labor party had gone downward continually since the year 1898; that it now legally and practically had ceased as a party, and that it had only a nominal paper existence.

Your delegate stated that the Socialist party had 42,000 members and cast 450,000 votes, while the membership of the so-called Socialist Labor party could not be determined. However, at national referendum, they only cast about three or four hundred votes and their vote in the last presidential election was less than thirteen thousand. Your delegate, moreover, pointed out that under these conditions the Socialist Labor party could at best be considered a propaganda club. And that as long as we had over ninety-seven per cent of the total Socialist vote cast, and even a larger percentage of the membership, it was ridiculously unjust and unjustly ridiculous to grant the Socialist Labor party the same representation as we have, that is, one man each on the Bureau.

Whereupon the representative of the Socialist Labor party, a man by the name of Kretlow, who lives in Berlin, Germany (and whom nobody seemed to know, and least of all the German delegates), began to recite a long story that the Socialist party of America is made up of ex-preachers, lawyers, business men and bourgeois only; that it was not a workingmen's party and that all the workingmen were in the Socialist Labor party.

I did not answer any of these so-called arguments, because it was plainly to be

seen from the faces of those present that he made exactly the same impression on them as on me.

Only when Mr. Kretlow claimed that we were fusing everywhere with the Republicans and Democrats, I interrupted with the words, "That is a lie."

And by that time the patience of the chairman and of the Bureau seemed to be exhausted. Mr. Kretlow was told to sit down and the Bureau went on with its other business, with the decision that the matter of the election of the two secretaries for America should be left entirely to the American delegation in Copenhagen.

Comrade Labrada of Mexico then made a statement concerning the way in which the Mexican government there is oppressing the people and particularly labor. He also called attention to the fact that a Mexican refugee in Los Angeles was in danger of being extradited to Diaz. Upon motion of your delegate the matter of the Mexican refugee was referred to Comrade John C. Chase, president of the Political Refugee Defense League of America, and furthermore the International Bureau was instructed to frame resolutions asking the Socialist members of the various parliaments to call the attention of their respective legislative bodies to the atrocious government in Mexico whenever there is a chance for this.

On Monday the parliamentary commission met and there was an interesting discussion on old age pensions, and insurance against sickness, invalidity and non-employment.

There were present at the meeting among others Singer and Molkenbuhr from Germany, Adler from Austria, Troelestra and Van Koll from Holland, Keir Hardie and Quelch from England, Rubinovich from Russia, Vandervelde and Anseele from Belgium, Guesde and Vaillant from France.

Jaurès and Bebel were absent, the first on account of business and the other on account of illness.

The work of the Socialist Bureau struck me as being rather cumbersome and tedious on account of the three different languages, French, German and English, that are continually spoken there. The parliamentary rules under which it is conducted also strike an American or Englishman rather queerly. However, the International Bureau undoubtedly has a great mission to fulfill. And the earnestness and the caliber of the men who composed it are a guarantee that the Bureau will fulfill it.

Fraternally submitted,
VICTOR L. BERGER.

DEL. HAINES (Tenn.): I understand that these reports have been printed. Should they not have been placed in the hands of the delegates in order that we might intelligently discuss them? They have been printed, but never delivered to us; why is that?

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe that if they were accepted we should all receive them.

DEL. JACOBSEN: I move that those reports be adopted.

DEL. HUBSCHMITT (N. J.): And that they be printed and distributed to the membership throughout the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, that will be included in the motion.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): I think we should go slow. That is rather a big undertaking. If we are going to print fifty thousand of those and send them broadcast it will cost a lot of money. They might be printed in the Bulletin.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would not the

comrade be satisfied if they are printed in the proceedings?

DEL. HUBSCHMITT: I didn't want them printed to please me. If they are printed in the record that is satisfactory.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection that part of it need not be included at all. All in favor of the motion that the reports be adopted will say aye.

The motion was carried and the reports declared adopted by the congress.

ELECTION OF INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIES.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next business is the election of international secretaries. What is your pleasure, comrades?

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): Do I understand that in electing secretaries we are to elect two secretaries.

THE CHAIRMAN: The plurality is used here. I don't know what was intended when it was printed.

DEL. FRAENCKEL: I simply desired that information. Judging by the report of Comrade Berger this matter will have to be settled by somebody, whether this congress has a right to elect secretaries when we have no assurance that they will be seated.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): America will have sixteen votes.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Fourteen.

DEL. BERGER: I thought it was sixteen. Then it will have fourteen votes at the next international congress and the majority of those fourteen will elect two secretaries to the bureau. Heretofore the Socialist Labor Party had one secretary, although as Comrade Fraenckel knows, we have about ninety-seven per cent of the vote. Now it is ridiculous to grant the Socialist Labor Party just as big a representation as we have. It is simply ridiculous. Besides, they use it in their propaganda everywhere, telling everybody that they are part of the international movement, and they have a delegate there and are represented there. They use it against us. It is poor policy to let them have it when they are not entitled to it. I was told at the last meeting of the Bureau that that was entirely left to us. If we elect the delegates and don't want to give them a secretary then it is absolutely our own business. I believe we ought to elect two secretaries. I am not at all inclined to exclude them altogether; let them have fourteen votes let them have one. That is more than they are entitled to. You can hardly give them less although some of them have only half a vote.

Now I believe Dan DeLeon, that old friend of mine, has said some awful things about me for many years, as you all know, but I am willing he should have one vote and the other thirteen ought to belong to us. And the thirteen should elect two international secretaries. The thirteen can elect any two that are there. We will send just eight who will poll the thirteen votes. However, we want the opinion of this congress who the two secretaries ought to be. That is all there is to it. The international delegates are elected by referendum; they will have to elect the secretaries; however, they will be guided by your judgment in the matter.

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I move that our delegates at the International Con-

gress be instructed to vote for our present incumbents, Morris Hillquit and Victor L. Berger, as international secretaries.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of that motion will please say aye. Those opposed no. The motion is carried with one vote opposed.

LIMITING DEBATE ON ANY SUBJECT.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I desire to ask a question because I am not exactly clear, and if you will permit me to state my purpose then perhaps you can answer me more intelligently. As you know, the intention was that this congress should adjourn tomorrow night at the latest. We have only transacted really one piece of business—

DEL. BERGER: And we didn't do that right.

DEL. GOEBEL: I voted the other way and I think we did. If we take the same time on other subjects we shall not get through by Sunday night. Now it seems to me that in order that we may ensure getting through some time we might adopt a rule that no subject shall be debated beyond a certain time and then we proceed to have the summing up speeches and the vote. Now I will make a motion to bring this before the house and you can decide whether it is in order or not. My motion is that at no time shall any debate extend beyond three hours before the summing up speeches are made and the vote then taken; and that so far as possible the chairman in recognizing speakers shall recognize speakers pro and con, on both sides of the matter. I can make that plainer in writing, but I think you understand what I mean by it. It does not mean that everything must necessarily be debated that long, but it means that no matter what the subject it cannot be debated more than three hours.

THE CHAIRMAN: With a ten minute limit on speakers and thirty minutes for the reporters I do not see how you can make that effective, unless a number of the delegates will make up their minds that they will not speak ten minutes, and not say anything if they have not anything to say.

DEL. MAURER (Pa.): I am glad that Comrade Goebel sees the error he made when he opposed my motion to have the speeches limited to ten min-

utes. I think we could get over this matter very nicely if we adopted the plan we had some years ago when each of the states would select a speaker to represent that state. I think each state knows well who will be the best qualified to speak on the question before us. Some states won't want to speak on it at all. The delegates from each state can make their points among themselves and then have the speaker speak for the whole state. I offer that as an amendment to Comrade Goebel's motion.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): We had a little hysteria this afternoon; now we are going to have a little more hysteria. We are to put a rope on ourselves for fear that we shall run away. This idea of confining ourselves to three hours, no matter what the subject, putting ourselves in a Procrustean bed, getting so much knowledge in a given time is ridiculous. The amendment of Comrade Maurer is even worse. Every state would want to talk and moreover every state is not a unit, and Milwaukee might not vote together, and I should hate to see a fight among the Milwaukee delegation on the floor of the congress. I do not look upon speaking as a privilege. I look upon it as a service to the congress. You will notice I have not done much service so far. I hope that these arbitrary motions will not be adopted.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I would rather limit the time of the reporters. It is not necessary for them to have thirty minutes or even fifteen minutes to close. That is the rule and you ought to change that rule. On this state question many states have only one delegate. That makes him speak on every question. That is the danger. Then the comrade who made the motion would have us in a state submit to one man or have a fight, as Comrade Simons suggested. I move you, Comrade Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: There is already a motion.

DEL. BERGER: I move to amend it so that the reporters also be limited to fifteen minutes. They can report a whole lot in fifteen minutes.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): I do not believe we should go to extremes tonight. If the women were doing all the work you would expect our emotions to run away with us, because we are supposed to be governed by our emotions rather than by our reason-

ing faculties. It seems to me we are just getting acquainted with ourselves tonight, and realize our limitations, but we must not run away with ourselves and go to the other extreme. We should have got acquainted with ourselves before we left home and let off some of the steam, out on the street corner, and be ready when we came here to do business in a sensible manner. I am not in favor of Comrade Goebel's motion. We have already limited the time for each speaker to ten minutes. Now there are important matters to come before the congress and I want to say that if comrades will exercise a little control over themselves so that they won't annoy the speaker and the congress by constant points of order, and fine distinctions on rules of procedure for the purpose of showing what fine parliamentarians we are, we will get along better. We women know something of parliamentary law too, but we have retained sufficient self-control that we don't annoy the chairman at every opportunity. And after all, constitutions and rules of procedure are adopted to facilitate business. We sometimes forget that they are simply an instrument to be used for an end. We use them for our convenience that we may do business. But we have had such a display of parliamentary tactics today that I rather think if we went along in a little more anarchistic fashion we might do more business. Remember that we are representatives of a working class party and the working class ought to be charmed by some of their representatives.

Now I am going to suggest to the sergeant at arms that if he cannot control the delegates that he should appoint some women assistants. I am opposed to Comrade Goebel's motion; and I am in favor of the amendment that the time of reporters shall be limited to fifteen minutes.

DEL. WORK (Ia): I just want to say that I made a report here which was so hot that it had to be put in cold storage for awhile and when it comes up I want my full time to close the discussion of it. I do not think that I ought to be barred out of that opportunity.

DEL. BERGER: I move the previous question.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I have a closing word. You will find I have

not spoken for two days; so I practice what I preach. I think the most important thing here is the Committee on Constitution. Our papers for the last six months have been filled with all sorts of criticisms on our constitution, and it seems to have been considered important as it is the last thing on the programme. I have my expenses paid me and three dollars a day and some of the delegates are not paid a penny.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can help them if you will close so that we can proceed.

DEL. GOEBEL: If you will let me alone I will close. My motion means this: we have at least four main topics and this means that each of them can take half a day. Ten minutes means that we can have eighteen speeches and then the reporter or chairman of the committee, and that means prac-

tically half a day. If we cannot settle those questions in half a day it seems to me that we cannot settle them at all. If you want to see how the women carry on a debate wait until the Women's Committee report comes up and then we men can sit silent and smile.

The motion to limit the debate on any one subject to three hours was lost on a division.

The motion of Delegate Berger to limit the reporters and chairmen of committees to fifteen minutes was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next business is the report of the Woman's National Committee. Comrade May Wood-Simons, I believe, is the reporter.

Delegate M. W. Simons then read the report as follows:

REPORT ON PROPAGANDA AMONG WOMEN.

To the National Congress Socialist Party:

In submitting our report we, The Woman's National Committee, will dwell briefly upon the facts which brought about the creation of our committee, and upon the questions essential to the development of a healthy class consciousness among women.

We have watched closely the growing interest in the woman question which is going on the world over and, after due consideration, have come to the conclusion that its rapid development and growth is due more to woman's entrance upon the economic field, to her becoming an important factor in industry, than to her awakening sex consciousness.

Women have come to share in our industrial life. In the United States alone the number of wage earning women reaches almost six millions, or about one-third of our industrial population. And this situation is still varying from day to day, ever presenting new phases and giving birth to new problems which demand the earnest attention of the Socialist party—the only representative body of the working class.

Comrades, on our ability to cope with this force will depend not only the enlistment and support of the working women, but also the rapid introduction of the principles of Socialism into the homes of the working class. Our close study of this problem shows us that we have many different phases to reckon with in our propaganda of Socialism among women.

We must first of all discover and adopt the easiest method of awakening the still dormant thought of the average woman, and for this reason we must place ourselves in her position, always bearing in mind the great disadvantages woman has been laboring under for many centuries. We must take into account the double task she is performing today and the utter lack of privileges that are hers. In this way alone, and not along the general lines of propaganda among the working class at large, can we hope to reach the millions of female toilers, who work in and out of the home.

Such an undertaking is impossible for our party as a whole, hence the necessity of a special committee which would give its time and attention to the propaganda of Socialism among women.

In her book, "Women and the Trades," Elizabeth Butler justly says: "The numbers of women workers in competitive industry are greater today than they were

fifty, twenty-five or even ten years ago. There is every indication that these numbers will continue to increase proportionately, as we have no reason to believe that the problems presented by the industrial employment of women will be solved by cessation of that employment."

We quote the statement of a woman who has spent many years in investigating the conditions she describes and wish to emphasize the fact that what is true in the economic world is equally true in reference to woman's position in the Socialist party.

Many years ago our comrades, in accord with the Socialist principles of equality, inserted the equal suffrage clause in our platform. But it remained a dead letter until the progress of industrial evolution brought woman to the front. Even as late as 1904, during the session of our National Convention, we find only five women delegates there. The woman question in general and the propaganda of Socialism among women in particular was not mentioned at all during the entire period of the convention.

The last three years have marked a great exodus of women from the home into the industrial and business world. Woman's unrest became world-wide and, in view of these facts, the International Congress in session at Stuttgart placed itself on record by recommending a more active propaganda for woman's enfranchisement.

A year later our American comrades assembled in National Convention at Chicago appointed a special committee for the propaganda of Socialism among women. At that time we find nineteen women delegates on the floor of the convention, many of them taking a prominent part in the proceedings.

None can help realizing that the woman question today is as truly an economic question as the general labor question. The only reason we advocate special methods for propaganda among women is the fact that those of us who have many years of experience in actual work among women, both on the industrial and political field, have come to the conclusion that the general make-up of woman's trend of thought, of her interests and sympathies, is, at least for the present, greatly different from that of the man, which does not mean that it is inferior. The executive body of the party has also come to the conclusion that not all people can be reached by the same methods of propaganda. We do not attempt to apply the same means of propaganda in converting the college man as we do the laborer, the Slav as we do the Anglo-Saxon.

The majority of the female sex is today degraded and enslaved because of economic dependence. If the problem of existence is a difficult matter for the man it is still more so for the woman and, unfortunately for the latter, she has so long attached her existence to that of man, that we find her at present lacking in some qualities which carry independence with them. But her extreme suffering, on the other hand, assigns the working woman from the start to the ranks of the fighting proletariat.

The industrial development has thrust woman into the world to become an atom among many others. You will find her in our mills, factories, mines, workshops and stores—out of some three hundred and fifty-eight trades, there are scarcely more than eight left where woman is not employed. But, though torn away from the home and her old environments, woman still remains a slave to its traditions and superstitions.

The increasing disinheriting of the masses, their ever growing deprivation, is affecting the wage-earning woman and even more so the workingman's wife. Woman, as a goodly portion of our wage earning population whose shortage in bread is increasing daily, will surely become a powerful factor in the progress of our movement, and this as soon as we enable her to understand the causes to which her hardships are due, and the inevitable way out of them.

As mothers and wives of the human race, women possess a power which, when awakened, will hasten the emancipation of the working class. Comrades, if you will but think for a brief moment of the future generation of young Socialists born and reared by Socialist mothers, you will surely consider our efforts to enlist women into our ranks an absolute necessity.

The cause of woman's economic slavery may be traced, like that of the man, to private ownership of the means of production. We must arouse woman to the

gross injustice of her economic condition. We must induce the working woman to accept the theories and principles of Socialism, for that alone will ameliorate her condition.

THE WOMAN'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

The last National Convention assembled in May, 1908, elected a committee of five women to take charge of the propaganda of Socialism among women. The whole proceeding was a new phase in our National organization.

The newly elected committee found itself under great limitations and lack of autonomy. To this committee was intrusted the task of managing and regulating the work of organization among women, but it was given no means to carry out its mission. Thus it happened that much time and energy were wasted.

The committee was granted the privilege of putting a special Woman's National organizer in the field.

For a long while our correspondence was carried on by one of our members and only for the last few months has it been done through the National Office.

Its first action immediately after being elected was to appoint Comrade Prevey as Woman's National organizer. In accordance with the decision of the convention, she was assigned to make a tour of the four suffrage states. The next matter undertaken was the publication of Comrade Maynard's leaflet and the attempt to form local woman's committees in every well organized city, town and village. This action has since proved to be a great factor in arousing the interest in Socialism among women at large as well as in bringing the newly organized woman's trade union movement closer to our folds. In various centers of our Nation the local committees have distributed thousands upon thousands of leaflets pertaining to woman and her relation to Socialism, the leaflets having been published by different publishing firms on their own accord.

Next came the gathering of signatures for woman's enfranchisement. Many thousands of these lists have been filled by our party members and sympathizers and collected by the chairman of our committee, who then sent them in a bulk to the suffrage headquarters. Some of our comrades may be skeptical as to the advantages gained by this action, and we wish to remind them that the Woman's National Committee had accompanied the petition lists with a letter to the comrades urging them to make the gathering of signatures at the same time a means of advocating Socialism. And in many instances the comrades followed out our recommendations.

A little later came the inauguration of Woman's Day—an action that has gained us the respect of our enemies and the approval of every liberal minded man and woman. Then came the printing of Comrade Stern's leaflet and the organization of study clubs, conducted under the supervision of the local committees. Comrade Anna Maley was elected Woman's National organizer, and the efficiency and success of her work is known to every comrade of the party. During the time Miss Maley has been in the field she has visited 152 towns and 125 local committees have been organized.

The New York Woman's local committee has done splendid work for our movement in taking an active part in the shirtwaist makers' strike, which fact has caused thousands of brave young women to regard the Socialist party with a feeling of kinship. Our committee has a uniform program of study in the Socialist Sunday schools under consideration, and we are also engaged in compiling a suffrage booklet which, besides giving detailed information as to the rights granted to women in different localities, will contain some excellent material on Socialism. With this the Woman's National Committee reached the end of its term of office and deems it wise to present to the Congress assembled a number of recommendations which, if accepted, will serve as a guide for future action.

In conclusion, before presenting our recommendations, we wish to remind you that this is the first report on Socialist propaganda among women rendered before our National Conventions. The main achievement of the Woman's National Committee has been to stir up interest in Socialism among the women of our Nation, and though but partially accomplished by the committee, its work has been far reaching in its effect.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

We urge the Congress to elect seven well qualified women, Party members of long and good standing in their respective local organizations, to serve in the capacity

of Women's National Committee for the purpose of carrying on a special propaganda among women, always with the point in view of enlisting them in the Socialist ranks.

In order to facilitate the work of the newly elected committee, we urge the delegates assembled to grant greater autonomy to said body, as follows: The right to act upon unanimously accepted motions dealing directly with the agitation among women that would not in any way involve the prestige or principle of the Party at large.

That the correspondence of the committee be carried on through the National Office as it is at present; that the committee shall not be compelled to solicit funds for the purpose of carrying on their special agitation, but should from time to time have the right to apply to the National Executive Committee for the reimbursement of funds spent on actual propaganda work; that said committee upon disapproval of its action by the National Executive Committee should have the right to present the matter to the National Committee, this with the unanimous consent of the Women's National Committee.

That the delegates assembled urge their respective states to keep a woman organizer in the field, who should endeavor to spread the teachings and principles of Socialism not only among the wage-earning population, but to carry the same into the homes of our comrades. We urge the formation of local committees, where same were not formed as yet, so that we may carry on a systematic house to house propaganda throughout the Nation, as we have come to the conclusion that this is the only means of reaching woman in the home—she, of all women, has been the most neglected.

In order to be able to account for all the committees organized and work accomplished, we recommend that the secretaries of the respective woman's local committees send semi-annual reports to the chairman of the Woman's National Committee.

As a means of coming in closer touch with the economic movement, we urge that our women comrades join the various woman's trade union leagues wherever same are in existence. In every industrial centre we urge the election of a strike committee to be in readiness whenever any occasion for action appears, as the surest means of gaining the ear of the women in the trades lies in helping them during an economic struggle.

We also urge upon our women comrades the organization of women into unions wherever the opportunity presents itself, for the working girl at large is very often incapable of grasping the principles of Socialism at the first attempt, where she would be willing to do so were she used to the economic organization, which is really the first step of her awakening.

Woman's disfranchisement being a great factor in aggravating her economic dependence, we urge the Party to take more direct action in the matter of woman suffrage, which should, however, be carried on under Party supervision and advocated from Party platforms. As the first step in this line, we recommend that the clause of our National Platform dealing with equal rights, regardless of sex, be amended to read:

WHEREAS, Woman's position in industry is of a much lower status than man's as the direct result of her political disqualifications, and

WHEREAS, The Socialist Party is the direct representative of the working class, regardless of sex, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Socialist Party demands equal suffrage, regardless of sex, color or race, and pledges itself to work, advocate and agitate for it.

We recommend that the locals hold at least one meeting a month for the purpose of agitating the granting of suffrage to women. We urge the women of our local committees to speak on suffrage from the Socialist point of view at every opportunity—hold out and indoor meetings, spread literature and make Woman's Day, the last Sunday in February, a memorable event in the Party annals.

We recommend that the Sunday previous to Woman's Day be set aside for general distribution of literature, and that our delegates to the International Congress be instructed to propose the last Sunday in February as an International Woman's Day.

The end of this decade may see woman the political equal of man, but if this should be the case the majority of our female working population would still find itself unable to vote, not being naturalized citizens. In view of this possible impediment we recommend the formation of naturalization bureaus and the agitation among our foreign born women to take out their naturalization papers without much delay.

As the last but not least recommendation, we urge the woman's local committees to make an effort to bring in more social life into our Party organization. For the utter failure of this necessary function as a part of our Party life may account for the lack of interest displayed in Party work by some of our best comrades.

We recommend that the Woman's National Organizer be ex-officio member of this committee and that she be routed by the National Office with the approval of this committee.

MAY WOOD-SIMONS, *Chairman*.
WINNIE BRANSTETTER.
THERESA MALKIEL.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I move that this report be accepted.

DEL. BLOOR (Conn.): I wish to move a substitute for one paragraph It is:

"The modern Socialist movement began its political career with a demand for equal political rights for all adults, without distinction of class or sex, and the platform of our own party contains a specific pledge that the Socialists of America would engage in an active campaign for unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women. This pledge was made in good faith and must be redeemed unequivocally and whole-heartedly. Our propaganda for the enfranchisement of women must be carried on, not spasmodically and perfunctorily, but steadily and enthusiastically. We must allow no opportunity for such propaganda to escape. Whether it be a legislative hearing, a public demonstration or discussion, the Socialists should range themselves on all occasions with the advocate of woman suffrage.

"In this country there is practically no movement for qualified suffrage. The American woman suffrage movement as a whole stands for full political rights for women, regardless of class and property qualifications. There is, therefore, less reason for us to conduct a separate campaign upon this issue than there is for our comrades in Europe, where the suffrage movement is to some extent conducted on class lines.

While the Socialist Party should never merge its identity in any other movement, we should not place ourselves in a voluntary position of isolation, where the principles and aims of our party fully coincide with those of other organizations. We should heartily support the general movement of the women of America for their enfranchisement. In this case, as in many similar cases, Socialism must break through the narrow circle of our own organization and must penetrate

into the masses of the people as a living and vivifying social force."

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is before the house to adopt this report. An amendment is offered, or a substitute for a part of the report.

DEL. OSBORNE (Calif.): The motion is made for the acceptance of the report without any motion as to the recommendations and it seems to me the recommendation of the other comrade is not in order. I offer the amendment to Comrade Simons' motion that the recommendations be taken up seriatim.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now properly is the acceptance of the report; and we are not yet passing on the recommendations.

DEL. LOWE (Kans.): I move as an amendment to the amendment that the substitute offered by Comrade Bloor be not substituted, but added to the report, and be included in the report.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): A point of order. The motion of Comrade Bloor is not an amendment, but is a long statement of fact, a statement of facts which we cannot make facts by merely stating them here and which we have no right to incorporate in this report whatever. Of course, I suppose we really have the right to do anything we choose; we have the right to make fools of ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are right.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: It would be foolish to make these statements signed by nobody a part of this report. In other words, this whole matter is out of order at this time—

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): It seems to me we are going at this very awkwardly. We ought to take this up seriatim. I think Del. Bloor's motion was out of order. The motion was to accept the report, not to adopt the report. I think we should accept the

report and then take it up as all the other reports have been taken up, and begin at the beginning. Accept the report in all fairness to the committee and then go at its consideration in order and not jump at the end of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understood the motion was that the report be adopted. The motion now is that the report be accepted.

On motion the report was unanimously accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, comrades, the question is on the recommendations of the committee.

DEL. CASSIDY (N. Y.): I make the motion that this matter be taken up seriatim.

The motion was carried.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): The first recommendation has been read, and I move to amend that by adding:

"Such committee to make its own rules of procedure and to fill any vacancies which may occur within the committee between the date of its creation and the next convention of the party."

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to this amendment?

DEL. BRANSTETTER: I object to that amendment. I think the election of this committee should take place in this congress. I think it should only carry over until such time as the regular election can be held or to some specified time, which I hope the Constitution Committee will pass upon. We do not want to elect our own committee. The National Committee should not elect the committee, the membership of the Socialist Party should elect the committee.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I understand full well that the Constitution Committee is discussing this in detail.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): As a member of the Constitution Committee I can say that a paragraph has been drafted that requires the election of seven well qualified women of the Socialist Party, by the membership of the Socialist Party of America, and there are other details which are not immediately at hand.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): It seems to me we are wasting time on that. I suggest that all recommendations pending here be referred to the Constitution Committee, to save double discussion—that is, if they belong with that committee—in order that we may not discuss them now and then again when they come back from the Constitution Committee.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I am willing to have these taken up one by one,

but I think we are chasing round and round in a circle. Now, if we refer these matters to the Resolutions Committee and the Constitution Committee, they may not make a report until the last thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suggest that we follow Comrade Goebel's proposition and that the men sit still for a while. They are the ones specially interested in this; let them handle this.

DEL. WILSON: I have looked over these recommendations and as a member of the Constitution Committee I do not see that there is anything here that would naturally come before us. They would naturally come before this meeting.

COM. MALKIEL: I am a member of the woman's national committee and I want to oppose this motion to wait and elect this committee later. We have a committee now, and why should we wait three or six months before we get a committee? You ought to have a committee at work right now. I suggest that we go ahead and select seven members in this congress right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are any alterations to be made to this recommendation—

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): Is the old committee a committee of seven members?

COM. MALKIEL: Five.

THE CHAIRMAN: The election of the committee can be taken up later. Let us proceed with these recommendations.

DEL. COLLINS: I believe the new draft that we have worked on for the Constitution makes this committee fifteen instead of seven. Why not continue the present committee until the election of a new committee?

DEL. O'HARE (Kans.): Delegate Collins is mistaken; the number was changed to seven.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the ladies know what they are about—

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I want to tell you the provision that has been adopted by the committee—

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is understood; they know their business. If there is no objection the first recommendation is adopted. The secretary will read the second recommendation.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): The second recommendation is as follows:

"In order to facilitate the work of the newly elected committee we urge the delegates assembled to grant greater autonomy to said body as follows: The right to act upon unanimously accepted motions dealing directly with the agitation among

women that would not in any way involve the prestige or principles of the party at large."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection that will be adopted. There is no objection. It is so ordered. The next recommendation.

DEL. STREBEL: The third recommendation of the committee is as follows:

"That the correspondence of the committee be carried on through the National office as it is at present; that the committee shall not be compelled to solicit funds for the purpose of carrying on their special agitation, but should have the right from time to time to apply to the National Executive Committee for the reimbursement of funds spent on Propaganda work; that said committee, upon disapproval of its action by the National Executive Committee, shall have the right to present the matter to the National Committee, this with the unanimous consent of the Women's National Committee."

DEL. KLAWIER (Pol. Section): The foreign delegates have something like that in the hands of the Constitution Committee. Instead of going over this twice I think it would be advisable to give that point to the Constitution Committee. Then we can take it up together.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't object to the congress adopting it? If you don't object, leave that where it is. Any other objections? Number three is adopted.

DEL. STREBEL: The fourth recommendation is:

"That the delegates assembled urge their respective states to keep a woman organizer in the field, who should endeavor to spread the teachings and principles of Socialism not only among the wage earning population, but to carry the same into the homes of our comrades. We urge the formation of local committees where same are not formed as yet, so that we may carry on a systematic house to house propaganda throughout the nation, as we have come to the conclusion that this is the only means of reaching the woman in the home—she who of all women has been the most neglected."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory? No objection. It is adopted.

DEL. STREBEL: The next recommendation, number five, is:

"In order to be able to account for all the committees organized and work accomplished, we recommend that the secretaries of the respective woman's local committees send semi-annual reports to the Chairman of the Woman's National Committee."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections? The suggestion is approved.

DEL. STREBEL: Number six is:

"As a means of coming in closer touch with the economic movement we urge that our women comrades join the various women's trade union leagues wherever same are in existence. In every industrial center we urge the election of a strike committee to be in readiness whenever any occasion for action appears, as the surest means of gaining the ear of the women in the trades lies in helping them during an economic struggle."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections? The suggestion is approved.

DEL. STREBEL: The next is number seven:

"We also urge upon our women comrades the organization of women into unions wherever the opportunity presents itself, for the working girl at large is very often incapable of grasping the principles of Socialism at the first attempt, where she would be willing to do so were she used to the economic organization, which is really the first step to her awakening."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section will be adopted. There is none. So ordered. Now this is where the suggestion of Comrade Bloor would come in.

DEL. BLOOR (Conn.): The reason for my substitute or addition is this: I simply want to make the report of the Woman's Committee as strong as the men's report on this subject of franchise. It seems to me we should adopt the position of Comrade Hillquit, when he says that we should have an unqualified and enthusiastic campaign for woman suffrage, just as the Socialists of Europe have helped the women of Europe in their efforts for universal suffrage. It seems that we should have more than is contained in this mere statement in the report. We should have a recommendation that we do as our comrades in New York have been doing, co-operate with this working girls' movement; we should, as we go through the other states, have this National Woman's Committee report to strengthen us in our work for woman suffrage. I find in my work in the Socialist Party and as a member of the party for fourteen years that in spite of the fact that we have this in our programme, I find that the women are not yet considered in a practical way fully a part of the body politic. I feel everywhere in working in the woman movement with women, that we want more support than ever before, because we are

deprived of the right of political expression, and any movement for the enfranchisement of a class so deprived must be a revolutionary movement, and I claim that this suffrage movement needs an exceedingly revolutionary statement in its programme on this question.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I suggest that we have already accepted that proposition in Comrade Hillquit's report, which we have adopted. I suggest that the comrade put that in her own language for an addition to this recommendation. There is no need to have the same thing repeated in the same words in two reports. Now I take off my hat to Comrade Hillquit's language on this subject. It is strong and good. But I submit you can put your thought in as good and as strong language, and I don't like to have as part of the report something that has already been adopted by the congress.

DEL. MAYNARD (Colo.): I think that this should be offered as a separate resolution, acted upon separately, and I request that it be received without action at this time, and instead of being put in the report, that it be acted upon with the other resolutions. It will simplify the machinery of the thing. They tell us we need to repeat this, although we have already adopted it in Comrade Hillquit's report. Putting it in our report does not make it any more effective than it was in the other report. If you want it more effective, put it in a separate resolution.

COM. MALKIEL: (N. Y.): When Comrade Hillquit's report was accepted it was said that it was only for information. As I understand the ruling of the chair, his report was not adopted, otherwise we would have discussed it then.

DEL. BLOOR: I simply make the suggestion, that this be incorporated in the report for this reason. I feel that the woman's committee should have a proper resolution covering this matter. I want this as a part of the woman's committee because I feel that our woman's committee should give a revolutionary expression of our principles on this matter without in any way conflicting with the general party principles.

COM. MALKIEL: I want to say that while I will take off my hat to Comrade Hillquit on many occasions, I will not this time. If Comrade Bloor thinks that Comrade Hillquit's recommendation is more revolutionary I wish you would read his report and then the committee's statement. You can then judge for yourself. Comrade Hillquit says: "In this country there is practically no movement for qualified

suffrage. The American woman suffrage movement as a whole stands for full political rights for women, regardless of class and property qualifications. There is therefore less reason for us to conduct a separate campaign upon this issue than there is for our comrades in Europe, where the suffrage movement is to some extent conducted on class lines. While the Socialist Party should never merge its identify in any other movement, we should not place ourselves in a voluntary position of isolation, where the principles and aims of our party fully coincide with those of other organizations. We should heartily support the general movement of the women of America for their enfranchisement."

Here is the report of the Woman's National Committee: "Woman's dis-enfranchisement being a great factor in aggravating her economic dependence, we urge the party to take more direct action in the matter of woman suffrage, which should, however, be carried on under party supervision, and advocated from party platforms. As the first step in this line we recommend that the clause in our National Platform dealing with equal rights regardless of sex be amended to read: 'Whereas woman's position in industry is of a much lower status than man's as the direct result of her political disqualifications, and whereas the Socialist Party is the direct representative of the working class, regardless of sex therefore be it resolved, That the Socialist Party demands equal suffrage, regardless of sex, color or race, and pledges itself to work, advocate and agitate for it.'"

I wonder which is the more revolutionary? Whether we should go to work with a suffrage party to gain the vote or whether we should work through the Socialist Party to gain the vote?

Now, comrades, if we believe in the class struggle, if we, as Socialists, recognize the antagonism between the classes, we cannot lose ourselves in any middle class suffrage movement. Comrade Bloor tells you she has worked fourteen years in the party; but I have worked longer than that. Besides, I have worked many years in the industrial movement. In going to the working girls you cannot give them many theories at one time. We ought to be glad and we are glad if they take one at a time. It takes all we can do to teach her that her interests can never be identical with those of her employers. It takes a long time to get that one idea into her head. When we talked of the class struggle to the

strikers in New York they asked us, "Which is right. One hour you tell us our interests can never be identical with those of our employers and then the next we are told we must all work together." The woman's mind among the working class is in that state that she cannot get these two conflicting ideas. If you tell the working woman one moment that we must fight for Socialism, that that is her only salvation; and the next minute you tell her we are all sisters together—this is a sex struggle, let us all work together to get the vote—you mix her up and you won't get her for anything. You must remember that we don't merely want to get the vote for the working women; we want them to know how to use the vote when they get it.

The woman question to-day is something more than a mere sex question. The number of women in industry is growing daily. Already we have six million women among our wage earning population. Woman is man's greatest competitor in the labor market. The Socialist Party must deal with her as such. We have spent four days arguing about a possible Japanese invasion. Woman's invasion is here already. It is our duty as the representatives of the working class to argue with her and get her to become a member of the class conscious proletarian movement. Many of our comrades do not realize yet what a powerful factor in the economic situation woman labor really is. And it is time we woke up and considered this.

I have often been accused of being a womanist. My contention is that I am a Socialist first to last, but a woman nevertheless. Naturally enough, having been born a woman, my sympathies go out specially to the working woman as a portion of the general exploited working class. As a woman I do not want to wait for the vote until we get the Socialist millennium. I want it right now, to-night, if I could get it. I will naturally do all in my power to get enfranchisement for women, but I shall always do so as a Socialist, keeping in mind that woman's present degradation and subjection will only be changed under a different system of society, and that her enfranchisement is only one means to that end.

The contention of our committee was, that we should not lose our identity in working for suffrage, which would surely be the case if we should co-operate with the middle class suffragists. Why go and speak under restrictions from Mrs.

Belmont's platform, when we can speak freely from our own and under our own party supervision? If you do this, you will find that every time you gain a suffragist you gain a Socialist.

DEL. O'HARE (Kans.): It seems to me that once more in this discussion we have seen the question presented from the standpoint of the conditions as they exist in different sections of the country. Comrade Malkiel objects to this substitute or amendment, and I think she does so largely because her experience in the section of the country from which she comes leads her to do so. My experience in the section of country from which I come does not lead me to do so. All through the west and southwest I find it is not impossible at all for a Socialist to go in and take an active part in the woman suffrage movement without sacrificing her Socialist principles in the slightest degree. I find that I can work in that woman suffrage movement, but I always lay stress upon the fact that only through the Socialist movement can we have a universal suffrage that will mean anything, a suffrage that won't shut out, as it does in many parts of the south the poor white man who cannot pay his poll-tax, I would like to have this amendment carried. I want the opportunity—I want the authority for going before the woman's suffrage movements of the west, and the southwest, and with this amendment I shall have it.

In Europe, wherever there is a fight for universal manhood suffrage, the Socialist Party of Europe has gone into those movements and helped them. I cannot see any difference between a fight for universal manhood suffrage and a fight for universal suffrage for both sexes.

Comrade Malkiel makes the suggestion that these suffrage movements are being organized by the political parties of New York. Very well. If the Democratic party of Kansas and Oklahoma is seeking to organize a woman suffrage movement I want to be in that movement. I can get the platform just as often as any other woman of that organization, and I say the Socialist woman has everything to her advantage and nothing against her when she goes into the woman suffrage organizations of the United States. I believe in being a member of these woman suffrage organizations. I believe in co-operating with them in every way that I can so long as I do not compromise the principles of Socialism. I am a

member of the Woman's Trade Union League. I believe in getting in there. I believe in making myself a part of it. In Kansas City, it is the fact that there is one member who is in the habit of speaking, as a general thing, and that member is Mrs. O'Hare. And when they want a speaker they generally select me to do the speaking. I don't care what subject they give me to speak on, I can always bring it right back to the Socialistic basis. I don't care whether they talk on the marriage question, or on the comet, I will bring the comet back to the Socialist proposition. Anywhere, any time, I am going to get my say when I want it.

DEL. ESTHER LAUKKI (Minn.): When Mrs. Wilshire invited a lot of women to a swell hotel in Chicago to a birthday party and tried to organize a Progressive League I told her it did not pay for a Socialist woman to try to organize the women who kept their maids; whom we want to organize is the girl who is working in the kitchen; that is the girl we want. I think the object in getting me to that party was to kind of smooth me down because they thought I was too revolutionary. Afterwards I received letters from Mrs. Wilshire and some others asking me to write some pamphlets to the working girls.

When we organized this woman's committee at the last convention, we thought that was the best thing to break up this Progressive League and to organize those women into the Socialist Party; and I think we ought to praise them for the work they have done.

I will go back to the Bible and I will tell you that a man cannot serve two masters. It is utterly impossible. If Mrs. O'Hare can go before those wealthy women and make them understand that what is a benefit for them is a benefit for the others, then she does not belong to us. Do you think that the bourgeois woman does want a vote when she advocates it? Then let her come here with us. We want the vote, and we want to get the girls to understand that they have nothing to gain by joining the suffrage league of the United States. If those women do say that you are all right, because you do sign your name to a petition for a vote, and you are present at certain mass meetings, you won't get her vote when she gets it. Oh, those bourgeois women will be kind to the girls. Perhaps they will give their hired girls their worn out gowns, or when they have a meeting they will get them all

there for that one evening. But what will they do? What will they say to those girls the next morning? They will tell the girl: "Now we are going to have the vote, you must remember, that if you vote for Socialism they will do this and this; if you vote for Socialism we won't let you have your job." They will be training our women voters. You think you will get their votes? They will cheat you out of them. They will put something through the legislature that won't mean anything. I tell you, in Finland we have got the vote, we have got women in Parliament, but there was not a thing done by these bourgeois women. Not until the women of Helsingfors, the fish wives, the laundresses, the cooks, and the real workers got out and paraded on the street—not until then did we get any vote. For about twelve or fifteen years, as long as the Suffrage Association existed in Europe, it existed in Finland. We have had some of the most noted women. They were all of the bourgeois class; and they were all advocating woman suffrage. They edited papers; they organized leagues; they were eminent women; what did they do? When they saw that the working women were organizing they did all in their power to break them up. When the working girls wanted the vote they said they were decidedly against it. They said they did not want the vote yet. When the working women wanted it then the bourgeois women were against it.

This recommendation, presented by the Woman's Committee, is what we want. Don't accept anything from the bourgeois women. If you want to work for the real cause of the working women accept the Woman's Committee Report and do not accept the one presented by Comrade Hillquit.

DEL. LOWE (Kans.): It is a peculiar thing for me to be standing before an audience and making a suffrage speech. It is a thing I never did before in my life. When I stand before an audience it is for the purpose of making a Socialist speech. But it seems to me there is a place in a Socialist speech, and specially from the woman's standpoint, for the suffrage question. When we talk of leaving it entirely to the working women, as our comrade from Minnesota has suggested, I am opposed to it. I believe in appealing to women on every plane. I realize that there are women in every walk of life whose hearts are in earnest in regard to this great world wide move-

ment. It is not a Socialist matter with hundreds and thousands of these women; but nevertheless they are progressive; they really want to better humanity; and they are struggling to find the way in which they can do it best. And if we as Socialists can reach those women I say we should reach them.

DEL. ESTHER LAUKKI: That is what I say.

DEL. LOWE: I believe it is possible for Socialist women to take part in any organization, I care not where that organization may be, any organization of women. I believe, that if we ourselves can see the great goal before the Socialist, if we can always keep that clearly before us, that we can enter any organization and we can bring the women of that organization to a clearer understanding of this class struggle, and as she gradually realizes what this class struggle is, she will take her stand—in the interest of her class? Yes. But by far the greater number of the women belong to the working class. Do you realize that?

Comrades, I can but judge from my own experience. I do not come before you as a woman who has spent her life in the kitchen either, although I have every respect for the girls that do. It is but a matter of the accident of birth whether we spend our lives in the school room or in the parlor or the factory, or where we spend our lives. That is not a matter that can be criticised in any way. But wherever we find ourselves placed in life there is something for us to do in this great world struggle. I come before you as a teacher. All my life I have been in the school room. I know that life better than others. I know that there are thousands upon thousands of earnest women in the school room who see the child before them, and they want to understand that child, to understand how to bring about the best possible development of that child's life, so that they will best be able to serve the great cause of humanity. I say, if we can reach the teacher, why should we refuse to go to that teacher, no matter what organization she may be found in? I come before you to-night as seconding the amendment.

I was very well satisfied with the Woman's Committee report; it was a very excellent report. I realize fully that our Woman's Committee has had a great task before them for the past two years. I do not believe we could have found within our national movement five women more earnest, more capable, better equipped to take up this

very important question and deal with it from a broad standpoint. I believe, that every woman on that committee has done her very best, and from personal experience I know that one or two have given many, many hours, and days, and weeks, and months to the earnest consideration of the various problems involved. I want to congratulate that committee on the success of their work; and I think that every member of the Socialist Party ought to be very proud of our Woman's Committee, but I do say this, comrades, if we can but keep our minds on the broader plane of this movement we shall achieve greater success. This is not a time to engage in personalities; this is a time when we should look at these things in the wider aspects of life. And as seconding this amendment—in spite of what Comrade Malkiel has said—I cannot see there is anything in this amendment to which we cannot all subscribe.

I seconded the amendment, because I thought it would be the means of avoiding this very clash that we have had here this evening. I did not want this discussion, this disagreement, just as we are entering upon this woman's movement in earnest; I did not want to precipitate this conflict on the woman's question; and for that reason I seconded the amendment. But I might just as well have remained in my seat, as I intended, and let the trouble go on.

DEL. LAUKKI (Minn.): I want to say to Comrade Lowe that I include the school teacher among the working women and I include all women who work for wages, whether they work in the field, the factory, the mine, the school room, or the office.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): Before I speak upon this question I want the chairman distinctly to understand that we women don't want any special privileges. If we take more than the ten minutes, I want you to call us to order. It must be just the same as with the men delegates. I want that distinctly understood. I am also sorry to see that the men are not taking a more active part in this discussion.

A DELEGATE: We were ruled out by the chair.

DEL. PREVEY: Your business at the present time is building a political party. For what purpose? To get possession of all the powers of government, and to change the ownership of the means of producing the necessities of life. That is

your business primarily. That is the only reason we are in existence. Now, as a member of that Socialist Party I don't want any fads or frills or isms. I want our congressmen and our mayors and our city councilmen to be perfectly free to do their work along that line. I do not want them hampered by any frills or fads. We have too much of that already. We are getting rid of some of our frills and fads. They are leaving us as the party progresses; and I am glad they are. That is why I am sorry the men are not taking part in this discussion, because they do not realize that their work as representatives of the Socialist movement may be hampered by some fad attached to them as representatives of the organization. I do not want our chairman to be hampered by the suffrage movement in the City of Milwaukee, and obliged to do certain things because a suffrage society says they should be done for that city. There are people in the city of Milwaukee who manufacture beer; the people there drink beer. Now, I am not an advocate of drink, but I do not want the Mayor of the city of Milwaukee compelled to take any particular stand on that.

And now to my point. I am well aware from recent experience that the W. C. T. U. has a suffrage department and many of those ladies belong to the Suffrage Society. Occasionally they get ready to clean up things in a municipality. They are going to do away with liquor drinking; going to do away with the social evil, and with everything else. Now, if we Socialists go on record as advocating co-operation with the Suffrage Society, we shall have to go out and do some investigating; and I don't want to do that. I am already obliged to pass on the morals of the members of the Socialist Party on this committee. That is enough.

Another thing; there is absolutely nothing in the report of the National Woman's Committee which prevents any Socialist woman from working in the Suffrage Society if she wants to. Nothing whatever. And I am perfectly in accord with the report of the National Woman's Committee for that reason. Why do we want any more? Is it going to make it any stronger? Decidedly not. I am perfectly free to take part in a debate on woman suffrage if they will give me a chance, but they are afraid of me. We had a fight in Akron recently and a prominent lady suggested that I be put on the programme, but I cannot talk from

their platforms. I am not going to ask for space on their platforms. And another thing, I have not got time for two movements. When the comrades in some other city say they want a speaker, that they have not got a speaker and will I come, I say, Yes; I want to put in my time that way. I want to be free to give all my strength, to give all my leisure time to the Socialist movement. I have no strength left for a bourgeois ladies' organization.

Does it give us any more authority to work in a suffrage association if we adopt this amendment? Decidedly not, I think the report of the National Woman's Committee is strong enough for me, and all the delegates know I want it pretty strong. I want it revolutionary; I want it clear on that point, so that we can go right ahead in close accord with our political party. I don't want to stand on the street corner and represent suffrage; I want to stand there as a Socialist, and I am going to stand there as a Socialist. And I don't want any frills tacked to me either. I hope I am going to talk at all times so that the members of the Socialist Party will be proud that I am a Socialist. For that reason I don't want any frills.

Now, comrades, I want the men to take part in this discussion. Let us hear from you. We have not voted yet. Comrade Hillquit may go to Congress next fall; Berger may go; there may be others. There will be other comrades go to Congress, I believe. I want them to go pledged simply to the working class. It is unnecessary for us as a political organization to adopt this amendment. We already have an amendment which says that we shall do all that we possibly can to obtain the vote for the wage working girls and women in order that they may be able to protect themselves as independent workers just the same as men.

Comrades, I am in favor of adopting the report of the committee just as it stands. And vote the amendment out of existence forever and ever.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (III): I rise for information. If this woman's question is to be considered as a serious question, let us be serious. If we have reached that point that the part of woman in our movement is a joke, and a laugh, and a sneer, and only women are to take hold of it, then the membership of this congress has a long way to go. I want a ruling on this point. It is not only that I want to speak on this subject. But I

have risen several times, because I wanted that question put squarely before this congress whether the position of women in the Socialist movement is a joke, the subject of a laugh and a sneer, or is it an important part of our movement? Are they to be here because they are pretty things to look at, or because we as men are chivalrous? I know of no chivalry in the Socialist movement; I know only equality between Socialist women and Socialist men. I want to know whether the chair's ruling is the ruling of this congress.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know what the comrade is referring to.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I refer to the fact that you said that none but women would be recognized. You have hinted repeatedly that this was to be left to the women. As soon as that suggestion was made I began to rise for recognition.

THE CHAIRMAN: I may say that my attention was called to the fact that Comrade Wentworth had risen several times and I had not noticed her.

DEL. SIMONS: If it was not done intentionally I have nothing to say.

DEL. BERGER: I want to say that she had risen half a dozen times and I went up and called the chair's attention to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us hear from Comrade Wentworth.

DEL. WENTWORTH (Mass.): I want to put in a word for the women of Massachusetts. As I understand it, the paragraph in the paper presented by the committee is in direct opposition to the amendment offered by Comrade Bloor, and I should like to state my reasons for being in favor of the amendment. I would rather have the paragraph as proposed in Comrade Hillquit's report than the paragraph of the committee's report. As I understand it, this paragraph of the Woman's Committee report means that Socialist women as a body shall not co-operate with suffrage societies. Am I right?

DEL. MAY WOOD-SIMONS (III): You are not.

DEL. WENTWORTH: As I understand it, Socialist women may co-operate as individuals, but not as a part of the Socialist body?

DEL. MAY WOOD-SIMONS: Our interpretation is that individuals may co-operate, but that the Socialist Party should not commit itself to the principle of co-operation.

DEL. WENTWORTH: That is my understanding. And that is my point. I

believe in co-operation, as approved, as I understand it, by the amendment offered by Comrade Bloor, which is the paragraph taken from Comrade Hillquit's report. I want to be clear about this before I vote.

In this connection I should like to state something of the conditions in Massachusetts. We are getting into such harmonious relations, and are working so well together, that I should hate to have anything come up that would interfere with our working together in that way. Now my experience has been just the same as that of Comrade O'Hare in Kansas. I frequently speak for suffrage societies on my own terms, and my terms are that every time I take the platform or the street corner and state why I want the vote I may state also that I want it because I am a Socialist. And I make them a straight Socialist speech. I never trim one inch. And they know it. And instead of refusing to have me, they would take all my time if I would permit it.

They wanted me for their big May Festival last Tuesday. That is quite a big thing for the Boston women and they quite insisted on my coming. I said I was coming here, but they knew perfectly well that if I took that platform that I should make a Socialist speech; they look to us for leadership and they are coming to do so more and more. They look to us as "the real thing." They came home from the Washington suffrage convention and they said that the best speech made there was by a Socialist. And if you will forgive the personal side of it I should like to show you how they are beginning to look for the Socialist interpretation of things, how they are beginning to see the economic side of it. We do not want to lose the ground that we have made. We are continually recruiting from their ranks, because we explain the Socialist position to them. This suffrage woman came to me and she said in confidence: "These other men say nice things about us, and say they believe in suffrage, but after all, they don't understand it; Wentworth"—meaning Comrade Franklin Wentworth—"we want him because he is a Socialist and he understands." And so the suffrage women, because we have talked Socialism to them, and shown them repeatedly the economic conditions which lie at the base of everything, they are turning to us as the leaders.

Another thing I ask you to remember is, that the wife of the bourgeois is

generally a far greater slave than the woman in the kitchen, washing dishes, because that woman gets her pay at the end of the week, while the wife—well, she is lucky if she gets any at all. She works for it and she asks for it, but she is the slave of a slave. So I believe the light of Socialism should be made to penetrate to every corner of the world from the top down and from the lowest up. They all need it; every one of them.

When we made our plea at the State House, of course, things turned out as we did not expect them, but it was not because we were Socialist women. The Socialist women were the largest group in this body of nearly a thousand women that passed through the State House before the committee, and there was a tremendous influx into that group of Socialist women. It was astonishing to see how they came into that group. So I say that in Massachusetts we are doing good work. We are glad to help on the cause of suffrage from the principle of justice, absolute, abstract justice. We know perfectly well that if the vote were given to-morrow to these women of the capitalist class, we know that a great many of them, most of them, perhaps, would vote for the capitalist parties. But that does not keep us from seeing the justice in the demand for the suffrage, in the abstract right of women to have the suffrage. So we know that in working for that we are making good headway for Socialism also, because we preach Socialist doctrines every time we get a chance. We preach the suffrage doctrine from that point of view.

So I hope the amendment will stand. Comrade Hillquit's expression is to my mind the broad and big policy and we shall make greater headway, it seems to me, if we adopt that, than if we limit the opportunities in this direction.

THE CHAIRMAN: If from the remarks of the chair as to women having the preference here in this discussion you can infer that the chair intended this to be regarded as a joke, then this very report is a joke, because it is signed by three women and not one man; and this whole proposition must be a joke, for it recommends that seven well qualified women—not men—not one man—seven qualified women shall be members of the committee. That is logic. Now the chair still holds that inasmuch as at the two preceding sessions the men were in the predominance, that in the discussion of this woman's question as presented by

this report of the Woman's National Committee composed of three women, and under which a committee of seven women is to be elected, I still think it is no more than fair to give the women the preference to some extent in this discussion. If you think that is a joke, make the most of it. I resent such a remark.

DEL. SIMONS: It is not a woman's question alone that we are discussing.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that well.

DEL. SIMONS: I want the men to take part in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, comrades, the party has allowed three women to handle it for the past two years. A number of the women delegates have asked for the floor and have not yet spoken. I do not see why they should not be given the opportunity to comment on the work of these other women. If Comrade Simons has asked for the floor repeatedly I do not object to granting it.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: As I have already said, I do not believe the question we are discussing now is any more peculiarly a woman's question than is the question of immigration. I say that this is a question that affects the entire working class. I say that the attitude of the chair and those who support him in that, is the very attitude that lies at the base of woman's present position. But I am not going to enter into an argument on that. I am going to talk on this question. It is a question that interests me thoroughly. The question of woman suffrage interests me greatly. I do not believe you can have a proletariat that is half slave and half free. I do not believe the working class can vote its way to political dominion with one of its halves disfranchised and enslaved. I go out to the working class and try to convert them to Socialism, because their hands are bound, and until their hands are freed my hands will remain bound; and in the same way, when I go out and preach woman suffrage it is because of the fact that so long as one half of the race is enslaved the other half cannot be freed.

Now for a few words on the merits of this question. I believe there is a wider sweep to this question than many of us are now willing to admit. One of the reasons assigned by one of the closest students of American conditions for the backwardness of the Socialist movement in this country is partly the way in which suffrage was gained by men in this

country. I am supported by practically every authority in Europe on this matter; and that is that the bourgeois of America, abetting the bourgeois little capitalist class that gained the Revolutionary struggle, granted the vote to the working class, not as a class right, not as the result of a class fight, but as a favor. And Comrade Berger and Comrade Hillquit and the learned men who know the European situation will agree with me, that the reason it is so difficult to arouse the workers of this country to use the suffrage is, because they did not win it; did not fight for it and take it, and because it was given to them. Do you think the German workers that walked in the streets of Berlin, that gathered in Treptow Park—do you think that when they get the ballot they are going to use it as the American workers use it? Does the Hungarian use it as the American? No; because he attained it after a fight with the Austrian as a class right, and recognizes it not as an end in itself, but as a means to an end. The ballot is not something of value in itself. It is what the anarchist says it is—only a piece of paper; but in the hands of a revolutionary class the ballot is the means by which we can gain control of the state and use the state for our own purposes. Do we propose to have the women follow the same pathway that has been fraught with such disaster to the men? Do we propose to have the Belmonts and the Morgans hand them the suffrage as a favor when they see that they are threatened by an ever growing working class movement, so that they may lead the people to whom they have given the suffrage against us on the field of political action, when we want to fight for better conditions for all workers?

Now you are proposing to turn over this power to those who control the Civic Federation; to the meanest, shrewdest, sharpest, cleverest capitalist class the world has ever known. They know what they are doing when they organize the Woman's Suffrage organization. They know what they are doing when they organize the Sick and Death Benefit system. They know, when they see the working class about to take anything, and that they cannot be stopped, that it is better that they should seem to hand it to them as a favor; and if in so handing them this favor they can absorb the organization of the proletariat, and substitute for that organization an organization that cuts across the class lines, they will make the revolution we are seeking infinitely more

difficult. These are facts that you better understand, both men and women. They are not so insignificant.

Europe has been referred to here.

(At this moment, on motion of Delegate Berger, the time of adjournment was fixed at 10:30 instead of 10 o'clock.)

I was greatly surprised to hear comrades here advocating going into any place and among any class and teaching the class struggle. I can hardly believe that by going into the parlor of J. Pierpont Morgan that we can preach the class struggle with any degree of success. I believe we are taking hold of something here that is deeper and more important than many of us realize. If they were going in the State of Illinois to submit an amendment to the constitution granting the suffrage to all women, I say that the place for every Socialist would be out upon the streets, out in the houses and the shops and the mills, the factory and the mine, taking part in that fight with all their powers without regard to who might be fighting by your side. But, if it becomes a question whether we are going to build up organizations approved by the Belmonts, approved by the Morgans, approved by all those forces that have crushed the labor unions whenever they have had the power, approved by the forces that have made up the record of Homestead and a long line of horrors, leaving a trail of blood down the line of American history; if the question comes between helping to build up such an organization and building up an organization of the working men and women of the land, my voice and vote will always be on the side of building up the true proletarian organization.

COM. LENA MORROW LEWIS (Calif.): It seems to me there is one point that we should get clear on. We cannot introduce into this country the same arguments that have been presented by Comrade Simons relative to the situation in Europe. We are not dealing with the conditions that exist in Europe. We are dealing with the conditions that exist here in America. In the political activities of the people of this country the ballot is the means whereby they function. We are face to face with the situation that one half of the people of this country possess the ballot and the other half are dispossessed. So far as this particular issue is concerned let us draw a line right down this middle aisle, and we shall assume that the men are on this side and the women are on this side. Over on this side are

capitalist men and working men; and the thing that they have in common is the ballot; and over on this side are the working women and the capitalist women; the thing they have in common is their lack of the ballot. The question rests not upon the right of the women upon this side to possess the same right that the men already have on that side. We are agreed upon that point. The question before us is, how shall we go about it to secure the enfranchisement of this side of the house, namely, the women? How do we get the ballot? Do we get it by any action of the Socialist Party? Has the Socialist Party to-day any power to enfranchise women? If every last man of the Socialists stood to-day for woman suffrage they could not give it to us as a technical fact. They may favor it; they may speak for it; but they have not the power to give it to us. How do we get the ballot then? The method by which the ballot is given to any people is by amendments and changes in constitutions. And we must proceed by the ballot to secure the right to extend the franchise. Now, on the question of getting the ballot the women can agree and stand as a unit, and when that part has been secured, and when all have the ballot, men and women alike, when that has been accomplished then the division begins to come along the class line, and then the line is drawn across instead of up and down and over there we have the capitalist men and the capitalist women and over here the working men and the working women. You can't draw the class line effectively until you have obliterated the sex line politically.

The argument has been advanced that if the ballot is secured by co-operation with the bourgeois class that they alone will use it. I insist that working women will accept the Socialist philosophy in about the same proportions as the working men. And that Mrs. Belmont and Mrs. Morgan can no more control the women of the working class when once they get the ballot, any more than the same Belmont-Morgan crowd can control the men of the working class. If there is anything lacking it is possibly in our not having good propaganda among the women, and it is not a question of whether the Belmont crowd will capture the working women, it is up to us to present such a superior kind of propaganda that the Belmonts can have absolutely no effect upon it.

Again the bourgeois women, many of them, have not the same keen sense

of the class struggle as have the men of that class. They have not had the experience in the business world; and the cause of this fact is that woman is psychologically more social than man, because from a biological viewpoint her nature is social. The fact is evidenced in the women's clubs of the country. Look at their programmes. What do you find? What are their subjects? The women's federations always take up public and civic and social questions. In New Orleans the question arose whether or not they should have a new sewerage system, and the men of the city voted it down by a large vote, and then the women got busy and they said "We want the right of franchise," and when those bourgeois women of New Orleans went to the polls they carried the proposition to introduce a new sewerage and water system, and the result is that New Orleans has reduced her death rate remarkably on account of that fact. The motive power back of that was the social instinct of the women, that seeks to protect society, because she saw farther than the men did. I recognize the fact that the woman in the business activities of life may find that economic conditions overcome the social instinct, but we have this advantage, that woman's nature is at its basis a social nature. This distinction is seen even in children. Little girls begin early to play social games; while boys begin just as early to play competitive games.

We should put ourselves clearly on record so that the women suffrage people cannot point to us and say, "You are against suffrage, because you have adopted a resolution against it."

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I should not have taken part in this discussion were it not for the fact that the proposed amendment happens to be taken from my report. I cannot therefore help but be in sympathy with this measure; but I doubt whether it was quite wise to introduce it in this form at this time. But as the question is up it is just as well to settle it on its merits.

Now, there is one thing I warn you against, comrades, and that is deciding a thing one way or the other upon a catchword, co-operation, independence, and so on. We don't want that. We want to know in what way this amendment changes the original motion. Then we shall know whether we

should adopt it or not. For instance, Comrade A. M. Simons, who was the only excitable lady that we have had on the floor here, and who spoke so violently—comrade, did you read the proposed amendment?

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: You bet I read it; read it when it came off the type; read it in the Daily Socialist; and read it again tonight.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I take your word for it. Now, this amendment says that while we should never merge our identity in any other movement we should not place ourselves in a voluntary position of isolation, where the aims and principles of our party fully coincide with those of other organizations. We should heartily support the general movement of the women of America for their enfranchisement. Now when you speak of co-operation in the sense of merging our identity you speak of something not before you.

DEL. SIMONS: Perhaps you better read that report; it is very interesting.

DEL. HILLQUIT: (Reading.) "In this case Socialism must break through the narrow circle of our own organization and must penetrate into the masses of the people as a living and vivifying social force." Let me tell you what I mean by that. I never for one moment forgot that we are a Socialist Party.

DEL. SIMONS: I must insist that you read that amendment. You have not read it at all.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I will read the entire thing if the chair will not deduct it from my time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I shall have to do that.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Now that there may be no sort of suggestion of unfair play I shall read it from beginning to end. (Reads paragraph from Report on Propaganda, relating to woman suffrage.)

Now, by this I mean precisely what it states. I mean that as a Socialist Party we have a Socialist philosophy and we stand for Socialism. As a Socialist organization this committee has two objects: propaganda of Socialism and working for woman suffrage. Socialist propaganda first and woman suffrage next. Where are we to make that propaganda? I will say to my dear Comrade Theresa Malkiel that if she came all the way from New York

to make a propagandist speech on woman suffrage to Socialists only, she might as well have stayed in New York. What we want for all our propaganda is what this amendment says: to go out to the world and preach it to the masses outside the party.

DEL. MALKIEL: Don't we say so too?

DEL. HILLQUIT: If the comrade believes there is no distinction, let us reverse the question and ask why do they so strenuously object? Our good friends answer us; we want you to do it as individuals, but not as an organization. Why, if it is good work when done by the individuals, does it become bad work when it is done by the organization? We do not stand for fusion; we do not for one moment suggest that our committees obliterate themselves; or that they take instruction from any one but the proper Socialist organization. But let me say that there are certain general movements of general scope. Say, for instance, there is the circulation of a petition in Illinois. What position in such a movement shall our Socialist woman's committees take? Shall they stand aside, or shall they throw the weight into the mass and lead the mass if possible into Socialism?

This is not a novel proposition. It does not apply to women alone. It applies to every other part of our policy. Comrade Simons justly laments that we are isolated from the working class. He laments that we are not fighting the battles of the working class although we are a working class party. We do not go with them in their legislative fights or their strikes, and so on. He says we should. I say we should. I say we should join with every movement of progress that is in the line of revolutionary Socialism, but always as Socialists, always sounding the message of Socialism. But going with the outsiders for that particular purpose.

As to woman suffrage, we have a certain pride in that movement. We are the first propagandists of it in this country. We have a lot of imitators. Shall we now, when the movement grows rapidly, leave it to the bourgeois women? I say our policy in this as in every other movement should be the same, and just as this report expresses it, break through the narrow circle of our own organization. And if any one

for a moment considers that this is an abandonment of the revolutionary, class conscious principles of Socialism, he has another guess coming to him. This is the only effective way of making revolutionary Socialists. You can't make revolutionary Socialists by passing resolutions in our own halls. You can only make revolutionary Socialists by going to the masses of the people and preaching revolutionary Socialism on every occasion. And so the duty of our committee is first of all to carry the message of Socialism as our committee, as an organization, and the suffrage agitation furnishes plentiful opportunity for that purpose.

I say once more, never for one moment compromise your Socialist principles, but you should not place yourselves in a voluntary position of isolation. What does that mean? Why do you object to it?

DEL. D'ORSAY (Mass.): The committee's report does not prevent comrades as individuals from joining in a suffrage movement, or co-operating with a suffrage organization, but it seems to refrain from putting the party in the position of endorsing the policy advocated by the amendment. Comrade Hillquit is an old Socialist, and considers it would not be proper for the Socialist Party to go into any fusion. But there are certain localities where the women are not so well up in the Socialist philosophy as Comrade Hillquit, and where such organizations come in conflict with the Socialist Party. I have known some places in Massachusetts where the suffrage movement in the municipal election supported either Democrats or Republicans. I could not as a Socialist be a member of such an organization. And there are dozens of cases where they go to work and help to elect a Democrat or a Republican. A Socialist who was a member of such an organization would have to withdraw. Remember, this report does not prevent Comrade Wentworth from speaking with or for a suffrage organization. But I as a worker in the Socialist Party since its inception have never found it possible to consistently co-operate in a suffrage organization. I have been asked in my home town of Lynn over and over again to become a member of the suffrage association, but I have said that I as a consistent Socialist could not join their organization. Time and again things were

coming up that would conflict with my ideas, with my conception of what a consistent Socialist ought to be.

Some of these suffrage organizations are more liberal than others. The suffrage organization in Lynn was supposed to be the most liberal you could find in Massachusetts. A year ago there was a fight for free speech. One of our Socialist comrades was a member of that organization, but at all times a Socialist. When we went before the commission there were two Socialists there and seven members of the Suffrage Association. And some one said, "Where are your red flags?" and the president and several members of the association said: "We don't want any red flag or Socialist truck here. We won't have them." So I say the committee report should be adopted and the amendment voted down.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I am heartily in favor of the amendment, but not as a substitute for any portion of the report. I wish to say this is not a question of whether Mrs. Belmont is in a suffrage movement. This is a question of the attitude of a national body to a national body. I suspect there are very few of you people have read the declarations of the National Woman's Suffrage Association of America. I am struggling for my class in the political organization of the Socialist Party, and struggling for suffrage, for women within that organization. I am a member of that National Association. In lining up with them on the suffrage question I do not give up one of my Socialist principles, because there is not one thing in the declaration of the National Suffrage Association which I cannot endorse. That association has always stood for unlimited, unqualified suffrage for women. No one here can point to a single resolution where that is denied. They declare unqualifiedly for universal woman suffrage for America.

Now, you men here should not be so sex conscious. This question should interest the men of the party as much as the women. There are issues here which we ought to meet and which we must meet. They are important issues. They relate to the line in which we are to work to get the greatest progressive benefits for the working class; and if we are to work for the working class we must take up

the struggle of the working class. If you favor woman suffrage you must study every organization that deals with that subject. Now in fairness to the National Suffrage Association it does not make any difference if there is a Mrs. Belmont belongs to it. It is their declaration of principles that counts; their official declaration. It is the official attitude of the national organization that is important. I do not know nor do I care what Mrs. Belmont has done in New York City, but I do know what the Suffrage Association has done in Oklahoma. I speak for the western section of the country. I know the sentiments there. While there may be more industrial workers in New York I wish to say that we have a strong organization in Oklahoma and that association is standing for unlimited, unqualified suffrage, and I don't care whether they have a Mrs.

Belmont in there or not. And the Socialist Party of Oklahoma has co-operated with that association and with the result that we have an initiative petition before the legislature; we secured nine thousand signatures, more than enough to support our petition. In that co-operation I have not given up one of my Socialist principles. Nor does any individual in Oklahoma deny that I am a Socialist. In mass meetings we have co-operated; and the result of it is that there is an assurance among all classes that the Socialist Party is for the working class first, but always for woman suffrage. I hope when you decide upon this question you will decide fairly, not with reference to one locality, but with reference to the whole question.

The congress then adjourned to May 19, 1910.

FIFTH DAY'S SESSION.

Secretary Roewer called the Congress to order at 9:30 A. M.

Delegate John G. Willert, of Ohio, was elected Chairman for the day.

After the correction of two minor errors in the printed minutes of Tuesday's session, the minutes were approved.

REPORT OF WOMAN'S COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: The business before the house now is the motion by Delegate Ella Reeve Bloor, who moved to insert a part of Comrade Hillquit's report, page 8, the first two paragraphs, in the Woman's Report.

DEL. MAYNARD (Colo.): I wish to move as a substitute for the amendment the following:

SUBSTITUTE FOR AMENDMENT TO REPORT OF THE WOMAN'S COMMITTEE.

Whereas, In three states at the present time suffrage amendments are pending,

Resolved, We urge upon our comrades in these states the utmost concentrated effort to secure victory at this time, and that we shall expect officials of the National party to assist to this end in every way in their power.

Whereas, In all states, there is an ardent and progressive woman's movement working for unrestricted suffrage,

Resolved, That we hereby express hearty sympathy with this movement and our pleasure in whatever common activity individuals, locals, or the general party find consistent with the fullest service to the Socialist cause; provided, it involve no organic affiliation.

Whereas, However, the one supreme guide to prompt and permanent progress is the class struggle of the workers,

Resolved, That our supreme interest and energy must be centered upon the education and the organization of the women workers in factory, office, school or household and the wives of the working class and Socialist comradeship everywhere.

DEL. MAYNARD: I want to remark

on the amendment, that there are two things in relation to this movement to accomplish if we can. One is this: We should avoid needlessly antagonizing anyone.

Often our essential principles force us to stand in isolation. This is all right when necessary, of course; but when we can fellowship with our neighbors we should be glad to do so.

Prejudices against us are tremendous at best; why add to them when not essential?

I had felt this report to be simple in itself, as it in no way seeks to prevent such co-operation with suffrage societies as may be found expedient.

However, this discussion here convinced me that this specific recognition of such joint demonstration as can be arranged is desirable. It will discourage the bigotry which is too apt to assert itself with no warrant from principle.

It is too easy for us to separate ourselves from the community. For example, this spring in Denver, we have had pending a water franchise and direct legislation and recall amendment. One party was pledged to all of these things, of course, yet instead of entering into the fight whole-heartedly, we grudged even a mention of these issues at our meetings.

So afraid are we of agreeing with our neighbors on anything. This spirit is all wrong. We should be glad to work in common cause where we can fully endorse a measure and where no organic or political affiliation is required.

These matters are trivial compared with our great goal, of course, but they have to be met from time to time and for Socialists to be indifferent and half-hearted is to stir up prejudice and do more harm than years of teaching can overcome.

This suffrage question is one of our demands which will be always to the front. This year it is to be settled, in all probability for years to come, in three states.

In Dakota full suffrage referendum is before the people for direct vote. The Socialists should head the fight. It will

not be a question of co-operation with the suffragists there. They will not want our help as Socialists, but the party should work on its new lines and harder than the others.

Our organizer, Anna Maley, has been there. She worked hard for the suffrage amendment, but the suffragists themselves were afraid of her, lest her Socialism should frighten the voters.

Here the two forces must work separately and I only hope the Socialists will work to such good purpose that they will win this great measure for the Dakota women, whatever the suffragists may do.

It is their cause and when it is right before them, as it now is, the party could well afford to give it supreme attention all the campaign. As a working class measure it has first place at such a time.

It shows we are still academic on the question that although suffrage is pending in some form in these states this very season, no mention is made of that fact.

The other phase of the question I intend to emphasize is one in which I am in full agreement with the committee's report.

Whatever work may be forcible in association with suffrage or other movements, the women of the party should not be given an idea that such co-operation is more than an incident.

The Women's Committee would soon be discouraged if they fancied their success lay in winning women's clubs or suffrage societies for Socialism.

When they can teach Socialism to prosperous women of leisure they should be glad to do so, but the chief work must lie with the working class. There lies the path of least resistance.

Remember, one of the most important groups is the women teachers.

Chicago is away ahead of most cities in the class consciousness of its teachers, and they will form a large proportion of a support which we may expect. For we do not want our Socialist women to think that when we say working class we mean simply shop girls or factory girls, but we mean working women everywhere, teachers, women on the farms and everywhere, women of the producing class that we have to win in this great army if we ever gain a victory. So that I present this amendment as something that definitely states the two things that we want to have understood.

First, we want to have no antagonism, no objection to any kind of work anywhere unless it involves the essential, sa-

MORNING SESSION, MAY 19, 1910

cred things in our party. On the other hand, we want it to be so plain that he who runs may read; that if you want to do the most with your energy in a given time, you must work where there is the least resistance, among those people who have everything to gain and nothing to lose by our proposition, although we have a kindly feeling for the others. Socialist women should all understand the splendid message of the class struggle and economic emancipation. Socialism and suffrage can never be of co-ordinate importance to one who sees the tremendous forces at work. Our women should see that economic pressure is the dynamics of history. We should be united on the essentials of our working class philosophy. Not as a creed.

Someone has said "A creed is all right as a guide board, but it is too often taken as a hitching post."

We want our class struggle to be not a hitching post, but a guide post, something that will guide us on to a sure, sane, careful path of progress, always toward the full freedom of all humanity.

DEL. BLOOR: I accept the substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the second willing to do so?

The substitute was accepted by the second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then this will be incorporated in the first amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further remarks?

DEL. ATWOOD (S. D.): I merely wish to make one remark, and that is that South Dakota endorses the position of the delegate who has just spoken.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I will not attempt to speak on this question, but I want to say that I consider that Comrade Simons last night raised this question from the plane of maudlin sentiment to the plane where it belongs. The fact of the matter is that there is a good deal of effort in the Socialist Party and a good deal of unconscious feeling on the part of the men of the Socialist Party to regard the women in the party and the woman's movement as a joke. I want to say, with all kindness and cordiality to the comrades who expressed that idea, that I believe it is not very fair. I sat still, smiling in silence, and listened while the women spoke to the point. I want to say that the day is past in the Socialist Party when there should be insinuations or inferences that the women in our movement or the women as a sex ought

to be poohed and ridiculed. The fact of the matter is that underneath the proposition to substitute, that was made last night, there is a settled feeling of the idea of chivalry, the idea that this woman question has got to be treated on a different basis than any other question. You can say what you please, you can make the statement as plausible as you want to, but the fact still remains that that is the case. Underneath it all there is a proposition and suggestion here that we should deal with it on a different basis than we would if the question were one of manhood suffrage. What would this Congress think if a proposition was brought in here that on a question of manhood suffrage we were going to endorse indirectly a political organization and go outside of the Socialist Party? We know what we would do. And yet it was argued on the floor of the congress last night—indirectly, I will admit, but nevertheless just as directly as I am saying it now—there was an argument proposing practically that we would endorse an organization as an organization, but could not affiliate with it but as individuals. Comrades, I want to say that it is unsocialistic to propose such a proposition, and I am amazed that the suggestion should have been made last night at all. I do not believe that we ought continually to be permeated by one idea in this movement or by one set of comrades, no matter how loyal and sincere they may be, and I want to protest against the conduct at times of some comrades in this party, prominent in the organization, continually insisting that their view on a proposition is practically the only view, even to the extent of approaching the chair and influencing the selection of speakers. I say that without any personal feeling whatever, but I think there is a feeling in the party against this business, and I recommend to the comrades that if these tactics were not resorted to a great deal of friction would be avoided on this woman question. The same proposition that was raised on the immigration question, I prophesy, is going to be raised on the land question, but there is an undercurrent against the whole business. You may think I am unfair, but I do not say it in a spirit of personality. I say it simply because I think the best interests of the party would be served if the proposition was put up to the comrades that the delegates to this Congress simply come here representing the party, and the officers of this organization should submit their propositions and retire, because they have no right to

come forward and insist on their proposition being considered exactly from their particular viewpoint; and I want to say, comrades, when that spirit has begun to permeate the members of this organization, in my judgment the Socialist Party will begin to grow a great deal faster than it is growing at the present time. I do not say that with any personal feeling whatever.

DEL. ROSE (Miss.): I have been insulted by delegates at this congress by the accusation that I was not respectful to the ladies at this convention, and I want to deny that in toto. I did not speak last night because of my respect for the ladies and because of my respect for the Chairman who asked the gentlemen to remain quiet and allow the ladies to carry out the program for themselves. Now I want to say something along the line of chivalry. God bless you, in the South we have—

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade, excuse me, but we are now talking upon the proposition whether we shall accept or reject the amendment as offered. Personalities today will not go in this congress.

DEL. ROSE: I want to talk on the amendment too and discuss it. I have a right to answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have no right to answer any personalities, neither will there be any injected into this congress today.

DEL. ROSE: If you allow one delegate to insult another, I have a right to answer him.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order.

DEL. ROSE: I appeal to the congress from the decision of the Chair. If the Chairman allows personalities he must allow me to answer those personalities.

Delegate Goebel was called to the Chair, and put the question on sustaining the Chair, and the Chair was sustained.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I wish to say a word in regard to the subject matter that is now before you for consideration. I made my declaration for woman suffrage thirty-six years ago when I joined the Socialist Party. Twenty-five years ago, when we presented that proposition to Susan B. Anthony, the leading woman of the suffrage movement—possibly of the world—we presented it not as individuals, but as the declaration of an organization. Susan B. Anthony, the head of the woman suffrage movement of that time, desired the support of the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, any

party that could carry the suffrage vote, or that they believed could. They did not care for the ideal declaration of the Socialist Party on that proposition.

I want to call attention at this time to a danger that exists in the agitation in the Socialist Party and by Socialists for this suffrage movement. I listened more intently to the lady delegate's exposition than I did to the substitute, and tried to get her standpoint from what she said. I may be dull, I may misunderstand, but I think she said that in pursuing this agitation by Socialist officials and Socialist organizers we should go into the other suffrage movements and not press the Socialist ideas or position, but simply aid other movements to capture this or that state for the suffrage movement and submerge the Socialist propaganda.

Now, let me call your attention. I get all the information that is published officially of the British movement and their work. I have known by reputation Mrs. Pankhurst for years and years, as one of the most prominent Socialist women in England in the suffrage movement. It appears that she occupied a similar position in the Socialist movement for the suffrage as our lady delegates occupy here, and now on this floor, and to push the suffrage movement to success the suffrage movement was carried out of the Socialist Party and landed on the platform of the opposition during the campaign, and the Socialist idea was absolutely submerged. Mrs. Pankhurst was

here in Chicago a few months ago, and banqueted, mind you, by the women of this city as the representative of the suffragist movement. (Applause.) Not only, mind you, does the suffrage movement bring that kind of submergence of the Socialist proposition, but the same kind of success or desire for success brings it in other directions, and the leader of the parliamentary group in the last campaign declared that he was not pressing the Socialist propaganda in his campaign. He was making the fight for the budget, for the other parties that won, and now there is a split in Great Britain caused by those men who are determined to submerge the Socialist proposition and make their fight on other subordinate things and keep them before the eyes of the working class.

DEL. CORY (Wash.): It has been the rule in this congress for the male members or delegates to carry on the work of the whole congress, and the women have very little voice in this

movement, and I, as a woman, demand that they keep quiet and listen now as we have listened for four days. The question before the house this morning is the report of the Woman's Committee. As a woman I cannot see why we should countenance anything that would appear to be affiliating with some other political association. We have been knocking at the doors of all political parties for years past for recognition and admission to their parties on equal ground. We have asked for the right of franchise. It is our birthright, and we should not be compelled to ask this of our party. I as a woman cannot see why we should ask for this to please us, when the Socialist Party has everything in its platform giving us the right of franchise and equal rights, and we as Socialist women have signed that party pledge, cutting loose from all other political parties, the Republicans and Democrats alike, or any other party, and I do not see why we should go over to the suffragist women and join them. We will receive them with open arms at any time into the Socialist Party, and ask them to come and join and help in this movement which is for the emancipation of woman, giving her the suffrage without going to any other party, and for that reason I am opposed in every sense of the word to anything that would appear like going over to another party. I am a Socialist woman, and I want the report of this committee accepted on those grounds.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): I desire to speak in opposition to the amendment now before the house, and also in opposition to the amendment which it is to displace. There seems to be an undercurrent feeling here among some delegates that what is wanted amongst our women comrades is a feeling not of class-consciousness, but of sex-consciousness. I am opposed to any feeling of sex-consciousness because it is not the duty of the Socialists or any part of the Socialists to inoculate our comrades with a feeling of sex-consciousness. We are here as Socialists, not as men and women, not to be inoculated with a sort of sex-consciousness; that is what we want to prevent. There seems to be a tendency throughout almost all of the debates we have had upon this floor to stray away from the class struggle. Comrade Maynard tells us we should use it as a guide-post, not as a hitching-post. I am satisfied to use it as a hitching-post, provided you hitch it to the class struggle until we

do away with the capitalist system. I did not catch all of this amendment that was offered today, but there was one phrase that I did catch, and I think most of us heard it, and that phrase is in effect that we will ally ourselves with all moral and progressive movements for the purpose of getting woman suffrage or the enfranchisement of women.

DEL. MAYNARD: I rise to a point of order. I said nothing of the kind. There is no such phrase in it. I wish to have it read.

The Secretary read Delegate Maynard's amendment.

DEL. CANNON: I wish to retract what I said in regard to moral and progressive. I misunderstood Comrade Maynard when she read it. It says "Ardent and persistent." I understood her to say "Moral and progressive." However, I am still opposed to the amendment, and I favor the original draft that was presented by Comrade Simons last evening. It is short, it is concise, it is to the point. We have a clear cut statement there in very few words, put in such a manner that every one of us can understand what is meant by it, and this amendment and the one which it displaces is a long statement; we have sentences some of which are plain enough and unqualified enough, and then we have other sentences qualifying and disqualifying them, and after we read it over we do not know what it means. There is entirely too much language. We seem to be struggling with a vocabulary that we must get off on every occasion, instead of confining ourselves to concrete statements of fact upon which we can all stand and which we all understand. There is a surplusage of words, and we must do away with it; it can be interpreted by every different individual that comes to talk upon it to mean something entirely different from what the other one saw. Therefore, I want a concrete statement. The one brought in by Comrade Simons is one that everybody can agree to perfectly, and it seems to be gaining favor among our women comrades.

Where is the other policy going to land us? As an illustration, you are all familiar with the Industrial Workers of the World. If you are not, you should be. Now, they started out upon magnificent lines, with a magnificent purpose, but they made themselves a sect. They disconnected themselves from the great working class movement, and they put themselves in opposition to the members of the Federation of Labor, and said,

"You must work with us or you cannot stay with us." The result was to smash and wreck the movement. You women that are agitating for sex-consciousness are doing the same with the women comrades. You are going to cut them off from the Socialist movement, and you are going to put them up on a pedestal with a halo around their heads, and you are going to wreck the movement. We do not want any Anna Morgan to say to us to go out and organize, and then when we get the girls and women organized, have them told that they must not have anything to do with those awful Socialists. We do not care for Mrs. Belmont's sympathy. It is very cheap notoriety at the expense of the poor devils in New York that have been thrown into court and abused in every possible manner. The little girls on the streets giving five cents of their meager earnings to help that shirtwaist makers' strike have done far more for the working class than all the Morgans and Belmonts ever intend to do to help you. The proposition to co-operate with the suffragist societies is not for your benefit, but it is to take you away from the principles for which you are contending in the Socialist movement. (Applause.)

DEL. MARGUERITE PREVEY (Ohio): There are many delegates present this morning that were not present last evening. There has been a substitute offered this morning that maybe many of the delegates did not hear read last night. In order to clear up the minds of those who were not present at the meeting last evening I desire to read what Comrade Simons had to offer in her original report for the Woman's Committee.

(Del. Prevey read the matter referred to.)

DEL. PREVEY: I would like to ask the comrades who are offering the substitutes and amendments, what do they want the Socialist Party to do? It was said on the floor of the hall last evening by some of the delegates who are present at this Congress that they did not care if Mrs. Belmont was connected with the suffragist society that they were asking the Socialist Party to co-operate with. Let me call your attention to one thing. The Socialist Party cannot co-operate with the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. Why? Because we know that the Republican and Democratic parties are financed by the capitalist class, and therefore under the domination of

I need more than merely mention to Socialist women the fundamental proposition of the Socialist movement, that any movement that is financed by a particular class will be dominated by the material interests of that particular class. (Applause.) That is one of the fundamental propositions of the Socialist philosophy. Then I want to say to you that if the suffragist movement is financed that way, it is very easy to prove that if some one is elected through the efforts of that society and it comes to some question in which Belmont, who furnished the finances for the movement, is interested, the result will be in favor of those for whose material interest and at whose direction the work of the suffragist society is going to be carried on. We would be just as consistent to advocate co-operating in electing some trade union man nominated by the capitalist class on the Republican or Democratic ticket as we are in advocating co-operation with the suffragist society. You know, we can support a trade union man while he may be of our class and a member of the working class as far as his trade unionism is concerned, but we cannot support him if he is on a party ticket that is financed by the class that opposes us. Therefore, we must take the stand that we cannot support anybody that will not support the Socialist Party. That is why I am opposed to any co-operation with the suffragist society. It would be just as consistent to support a labor movement launched by the Civic Federation and call it a labor party; we would be just as consistent to advocate co-operation with that as we are in advocating co-operation with the woman's suffrage movement. Let me call your attention to the fact that before you adjourn this Congress, you may be compelled to pass upon a proposition of that kind, and do not establish a precedent now. Support Comrade Simons' report. You know the work Comrade Simons has done, which is recognized everywhere. She has given a clear statement of this proposition, and I ask you to support Comrade Simons' original proposition and the report of the committee as a whole, and vote down all amendments that are attempted to be tacked on.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): We have a woman's committee, and there is their report. They are Socialists, not women or men. They come here and make recommendations, not as men or women, but as Socialists. I am going to speak as a member of the party and not as a man or woman. I have often spoken with my

wife on these matters, so I am talking for the family, which is very nice and will save trouble when I go home. I have said many times that every time you scratch an opportunist deep enough you find an impossibilist. (Applause.) The longer I live the more I am impressed with the truth of that statement.

I have heard one of my comrades here ridicule the idea of this substitute, while yesterday, in the debate upon the question of immigration, we were told we must follow the Stuttgart resolution. If we are to follow the Stuttgart resolution or the European Socialists in one matter, why not follow it in others? I do not pretend to have the close intimate knowledge of the foreign Socialist movement that my Comrades Hillquit and Morgan and others may have, but if there is any one thing that I do know it is this, that we must take a position on certain matters in furtherance of other matters germane to the interests of the working class. If I know anything of the conditions abroad I know that in certain of those countries the working class have either no franchise or a very limited franchise, and if I know anything of their actions there the Socialist Party co-operates with any party that will give an extension of the franchise to the working class and thereby give more power to the Socialist working class movement. Whether you know it or not, that is the proposition here to-day, and I say to the comrades who talked about the Stuttgart resolution all day yesterday, that if you have got any backbone and meant what you said yesterday you will take on this matter the same position you did yesterday. I am going to be man enough to follow the logic of the situation. What did the comrade tell us about the I. W. W.? He told us that it made itself into a sect; it cut itself adrift from everything else and as the natural consequence it died, and yet in the next breath he practically proposes the same thing for the Socialist movement. Let us carry on the suffrage work entirely inside the party. I do not propose for one to give these people free sway. I propose to follow them up into every place they go and preach this class struggle. The same thing is involved here that is involved in our attitude toward the trade union. Do you believe that we ought to co-operate with the trade union? That is the issue, whether you know it or not. If you believe in it, in that case, then, you believe we can co-operate with the women's organizations of this country as long as

they are committed to no one political party allied with the capitalist class. That is the issue here. If you are opposed to co-operation with the working class movement, whether I. W. W. or the A. F. of L. If you are opposed to that, then you can consistently oppose this substitute. If you are not opposed to that you cannot consistently oppose this substitute. That is the issue.

MAY WOOD-SIMONS: I rise to a point of information for the delegate. He apparently has never read the statement of the international congress at Stuttgart on this point. Will you allow me to read it to him? It is just a sentence?

DEL. GOEBEL: I will yield to Comrade Simons.

MAY WOOD-SIMONS: This is the resolution accepted by the Stuttgart Congress, as formulated by the women delegates and submitted to that congress: "The Socialist women shall not carry on this struggle for equality of right to vote in alliance with middle class women suffragists, but, in common with the Socialist Party, shall insist upon woman suffrage as one of the fundamental and most important reforms for the full democratization of the political franchise in general."

DEL. GOEBEL: That is good.

DEL. MORGAN: I should say so.

DEL. GOEBEL: Will the secretary kindly make a note that I said something that my friend Morgan approved of?

DEL. MORGAN: It took a long time to get to it though.

DEL. GOEBEL: It is good for the thing that it applies to. I have yet to be shown that the Woman Suffrage Association is a middle class organization. There was a day in this country when to stand up as a woman suffragist was to be ostracized. I know that that movement has developed along the line of persecution to some extent, and the fact that Mrs. Belmont or Miss Morgan or some one of that sort is coming into that organization trying to capture it or to gain notoriety is not going to make me lose sight of the essential fact. It is made up of all women for just one purpose, to get the franchise for women. Do we believe in universal franchise? I am not so much interested in the resolutions of the European Socialists as I am in their acts. Now, am I right or wrong in saying that every European Socialist organization unites with any other organization at times of crisis in seeking to bring about a further extension of the franchise

to the working class? If they do that in the case of the men, why shall they not do it in the case of the women? If we believe in woman suffrage, if we believe it is such an essential thing to the women of this country, let us send out a recommendation from this congress that will not be read either way, that will allow this comrade down in New York to say: "We have nothing to do with you; we won't work with you—"

COM. MALKIEL: That is not true.

DEL. GOEBEL: Let us say that we are going to do with the woman organizations of this country precisely what we do with the trade unions. Do I love Gompers? Hardly. Do I love Mitchell? Hardly. Shall I stay out of the ranks or organized labor because there is a Gompers or a Mitchell at the head of it? We did that in the town of Newark. We fought the trade unions; and they fought us. We said Gompers had them by the throat. But we changed our tactics and instead of saying Gompers was no good we went to the trade unions and said, here are some things that we believe in that you believe in. You may not accept all our views on Socialism, but you believe in free press and free speech. A few years ago, in Newark, there was hardly a Socialist in the trades council and now practically every member is a Socialist with a Socialist as chairman of our meetings. And I hardly think the class struggle has been lost sight of. In fact, the old party politicians are running around and skirmishing as they have not done for forty years. That shows me that we have hit somebody. And what we have found true of the trade unions we will find true of the woman's suffrage organizations. Do you know anything about this woman's political movement? I do. In my town my wife used to be an officer of it, and my wife and I are just close enough to each other so that we occasionally talk over things that we are mutually interested in. Now, in my town it is not a middle class organization. It is made up of the girls that live "On the Hill" as we call it, that work in the sweat shops along with school teachers and that class of women, and if you choose to say that that class of women shall not be co-operated with, all right, but for me I am going to march along with any man or woman who is going my way as long as they do not forget the thing I am after, or interfere with it, the wiping out of the class struggle.

COM. MALKIEL: I want to say a word to Comrade Goebel. When my

comrades come to me and say, "Why do you go to the trade unions, why do you ally yourself with the woman suffragists?" I excuse them because they still have very much to learn. They have still very little experience in the work of the Socialist movement; but when a member of the National Executive Committee gets up on the floor of this congress and compares the trade union movement with the suffrage movement, I am very sorry for his lack of knowledge of that movement or of Socialism. Comrades, we are the Socialist Party. We are the mouth-piece of the working class and therefore it is our duty to go among the working class, no matter whether they are foolish enough to have Mitchell or Gompers at their head. It is our business to teach them to get away from Mitchell and Gompers. But when we co-operate, the Socialist movement with the suffrage movement, what do we do? Why, we extend our hand to the other class and say, "You are all good. It makes no difference whether you live on those who create all wealth, you happen to be born a woman and therefore we can work and suffer and starve to help you out. We will all get the vote and then we will send you to Congress." Now, our recommendation offers every Socialist woman a chance to work for suffrage. It is clear. I don't wish to repeat it, but I will repeat two lines of it. "Woman's disfranchisement being a great factor in aggravating her economic dependence, we urge the party to take more direct action in the matter of woman suffrage, which should, however, be carried on under party supervision and advocated from party platforms." Now we urge you to do everything in your power for suffrage, because as long as we have one-half of the human race enslaved, as long as one-half of the race are powerless to express their views, this world can never be free. We want to do everything in our power in this direction but we want to do it as class conscious Socialists. We want to do everything we can for the working class. What does this substitute say? It does not urge you to do any more work for suffrage. It tells us we are going to express our pleasure to the others for their work. But what of it? Where does the consistency come in? We are going to extend our hand to them. We have no objections to their working, but let them work in their line all they want. But let us work in our line. Of course, if the Socialist Party joins with the suffrage movement it will

strengthen it. They are going to get the vote more easily. But is it everything for the Socialist to get the vote? Is that the ultimate goal of the Socialist? If you go out and join with the suffragists and then demand their vote, you will go to the farmer's wife. I was accused yesterday of talking altogether about New York. I am not so narrow minded as that. I am talking about the working class of the United States. In that class I include the school teacher; I include the librarian; I include every wage earning woman; but I also include every woman working in the home; the farmer's wife; the wage earner's wife; every woman who belongs to the working class. Now you will go before those women and you say we want the vote for all women, and you will tell them that these other people, those that want limited suffrage in England, you will tell them they are the finest people in the world. The working women will say here, they are very good to us. They give us the vote. They will believe they are good people. You in the west are confronted with a different situation from us in the east. You have a better situation than we in the east. It won't take very long before you will get your vote. What will be the result? You yourselves have taught your women that these fine ladies are the very finest people. Can you blame them if they vote for those finest people? But suppose you go to the women as Socialists all the time and you say to them: "You women ought to have the vote the same as your sons and your husbands and fathers; we shall do all we can to help you to get it, but remember when you have got the vote you have to use it and it is your duty to work hand in hand with the whole working class for the final bringing about of the Socialist co-operative commonwealth."

Now, Morris Hillquit said last night that I apparently came all the way from New York to agitate among you comrades. Perhaps there is some truth in it. I don't think it hurt some of you comrades. He says I should go out and talk to the masses. I have talked to the masses. If Comrade Hillquit and I were to compare on the talking to the masses that we have done I do not think that I should be the loser. But it is just because I want to go among the masses, and because the masses are dearer to me than the classes that I urge to accept this resolution which in a few direct words tells you what you ought to do. This resolution does not mean that you are

to confine yourselves within any narrow sphere. On the contrary we want you to go out to the world; go everywhere; into the palace and the hamlet; but it won't do you much good to go into the palace and preach Socialism—but you want to go everywhere as a Socialist.

Our friend Hillquit says it is a good thing to go there and work with them in this suffrage movement. Does Comrade Hillquit remember that when we went and worked with those people and we had a demonstration for the striking shirtwaist makers, originated by the Socialists, and because we wanted to have the world with us, we invited the other organizations to work with us in that demonstration, and when we came there and had our list of speakers, and we had Comrade Morris Hillquit as one of the speakers, that he had the hardest fight because they said they wanted a respectable meeting; they did not want any Socialist agitators? And the comrade knows the fight I had on the floor fighting for his cause and for the Socialist cause.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I hope that, whatever conclusion we come to on this, that I shall recognize all my comrades as just as class-conscious as I am.

As regards the Stuttgart resolution, I am heartily in accord with that resolution, which says we ought not to co-operate with any middle class movement; as I understand it, however, a middle class proposition is one that is for the middle class, limited suffrage, property qualifications, and so forth. Any proposition that demands equal universal suffrage for all classes is not a middle class movement.

I should like to get right down to the real difference between the report of the committee and the substitute offered. I consider the report of the committee is a position in advance of what the party would have taken two years ago, and in advance of the position that many of our members would take for many years to come. Many of our comrades believe that woman suffrage is none of our business at all. They also believe that trade union business is none of our business at all. They, as a general proposition, will be found voting for the report and against the substitute. Some of our comrades even objected to the Woman's National Committee being created. And consequently, when that woman's committee comes in and asks to have a meeting every month, that is far in advance of the old position. It is also advanced in asking us to have in every city strike

committees to co-operate with such of the working class as happen to be engaged in the economic struggle in that way. I want to say that is an advanced position, because when the strike of the shirtwaist makers occurred in Philadelphia, some of us wanted the Socialist Party to establish a committee to co-operate with them. We were asked to vote it down. Now, that is an advanced position, and I am glad to see it. I believe that, speaking broadly, what we are entitled to do as individual Socialists we are entitled to do as a body. I believe that this woman suffrage question is a working class question; I want to get the suffrage even though it may seem to some of my comrades who are just as class conscious as I am, that we are violating some of our principles in doing so. I think we ought to go as a party into the legislative halls, in the agitation everywhere, to support every measure that looks toward working class supremacy up to the point of compromising our principles, but there we must stop. Some of the comrades who think this suffrage question is a middle class question, don't they know that our comrades all over the world, when they go into the legislative halls, do not ask: "Is this a conservative measure, is this a liberal measure?" The only thing they ask is: "Is this a working class proposition?" if it is, irrespective of where it comes from, we favor it. If it is not a working class proposition, irrespective of the fact that it may even come from a member of our own party, we are opposed to it.

This is a question of tactics. And I am going to ask you to vote for both the report of the committee and for this amendment, because I believe as a matter of tactics we should go just as far as we consistently can and not do just as little as we can in this way; go just as far as we consistently can for every advanced movement because it is a working class movement and a benefit to our class, always stopping short of compromising our principles.

DEL. FACKERT (N. J.): I am anxious to see this congress hew to the line and not get into too many entangling alliances. We are liable to get mixed up if we do. I hope the comrades will bear in mind that there is nothing in the obligations that we take when we enter the Socialist movement that will prevent us as individuals from working in any of these movements. As the suffrage movement is not now affiliated with any of the old parties, and is not controlled by them,

DEL. MALKIEL: Did the Socialist women speak there?

DEL. CAREY: They did not.

DEL. MALKIEL: Why did they not speak?

DEL. CAREY: For the reason that the time allotted had been exceeded by the previous speakers. But comrade Wentworth was permitted afterwards to make a very lengthy and very eloquent speech to the entire body of women. There was one other group that was excluded because of the expiration of the time. I believe the Socialist women of Massachusetts did an excellent turn for the Socialist movement by marching to the state house in company with the others as they did, though they were part of a demonstration that contained many women who were not Socialists. It was their place to be there and I am against any proposition that would prevent the Socialist women of Massachusetts doing the same thing if the occasion should again arise.

DEL. MALKIEL: A point of order. There is nothing in the report that would prevent that.

DEL. CAREY: That is not a point of order; that is not even half a point. The situation is this: I am not clear as to the meaning of this proposition. I find two woman delegates from my state divided although they agree in their principles as to co-operation in this sort of movement. Will somebody kindly inform me? Does this original report oppose the women of Massachusetts doing again what they did in the case I have stated, if they think it best to do so?

Cries of "No, No."

DEL. CAREY: Does the substitute oppose it?

DEL. MERRICK: The chairman of the committee should be given a chance to answer.

DEL. CAREY: I ask the question through the chair. We save time when we proceed along parliamentary lines. I want that information and I think I have a right to it. Who can furnish it to me? I want harmony in my delegation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the comrade from Illinois furnish the information?

MAY WOOD-SIMONS: There is nothing in the report of the Woman's Committee as it now stands that would prevent any such action on the part of a group of Socialist women as the comrade describes as taking place in Massachusetts. Nothing whatever.

DEL. MAYNARD: I was sorry to see this trouble on the floor of the congress, and I was sorry that I offered this sub-

stitute, but since this discussion has taken place I believe the introduction of the substitute was desirable because while the report may not prevent such action as has just been referred to, it does leave the way open for any comrade in any local to protest whenever there is anything of any kind offered that is in any degree in conformity with anybody else. And therefore, while we should not go out of our way to encourage this sort of thing I think it should be clearly allowed.

COM. DICKINSON (Fla.) (Alt.): There is a sex problem that we cannot get rid of, and yet at the same time that we must get rid of, and this is the only national organization in the world that is brave enough to wipe out all the history that we have made on this point for twenty centuries, all man made, and that still tells us that we women are made out of one of your ribs. We have got to make a new woman out of the other rib in order to stand even.

Now, for the life of me I can't see the difference in these propositions; others can. In Arizona, Massachusetts, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Rhode Island, South Dakota and Wisconsin, they all went up against the suffrage movement last year and defeated it. Now, if in any way the Socialist Party can associate as a party with these movements that are working for the ballot for all women without interfering with our demand for the removal of the wage system, and for the removal of the environment that creates the wage problem, we ought to do it. But this original report, as I conceive it, does not in any way interfere with that. If from your point of view, however, it does interfere, all right. Biologically, what have we to use for judgment? We have simply what has come into our eyes and ears and noses, through all our senses, and been stored up in our brain. We all come from different environments from childhood up; and that is one reason we differ. You give fourteen similar facts to fourteen different people, and you will likely have fourteen different conclusions. Each must decide for himself. Personally I think the original report covers it all; and we need no amendment whatever.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): Now, comrades, the Socialist Party is at the point in this country when it will have to decide whether it shall be a sect or a political party. The moment the Socialist Party takes a position, whether it shall be a sect speaking beautiful phrases, or a political party taking fundamental principles and

applying them in terms of statesmanship to practical problems, at that moment we are confronted with practical questions such as confronted us yesterday, and such as confront us to-day. The question here is not the relation of the Socialist Party to women. The question is the attitude of the party as a whole to woman suffrage, to universal suffrage for women. That movement is old and is established; we were not the pioneers in that movement. We are here in our place to champion the class struggle. We know that we cannot deliver woman until we have delivered the working class. That is settled and taken for granted here. That is not disputed here. The question is, what shall be our attitude to this question that is hanging right over our heads? I am a member of a Socialist Local; that local is in Berkeley, California. I belong to the state movement in California that is fighting for universal suffrage for women, an activity that has been in that state for thirty or forty years, and is now reaching a very acute stage. I have asked the chairman of this committee if, under the original report, I can work for woman suffrage with this suffrage association. She says I may as an individual. Then I asked: May my local do so? Now I would like to have this matter cleared up. We want to work freely in our state organization and in our locals. We want to work constitutionally. We don't want to be bound. But if we are bound we want to know that we are bound. I am ready to submit to the party discipline, whatever it may be. The original report says: "Action should be carried on under party supervision, and advocated from party platforms." Does this mean that in our agitation as individuals, as locals and as a state organization we shall carry on our agitation only under party supervision and from the party platforms? I hope the chairman will answer that question when she sums up.

Comrade Carey says ten groups of women went to the state legislature of Massachusetts, and a Socialist group went with them. One group of women is going to the state legislature of California; shall our Socialist women go with them? Shall they stay at home? If they go with them, shall they speak with them? Shall they be permitted to stand on the same platform with them? Shall I speak for them on the same platform where somebody else speaks who is not a Socialist? The women of San Francisco have canvassed that whole city from door

to door, and they have gathered a vast list of names of women; that was done under the administration of one group of women. Our Socialist women co-operated with the other women of San Francisco to do that. Was that right? Shall the Socialist women of California refuse to do that? Or shall they get up a separate list and let the others get up a separate list?

Now, when we go back to our locals we can't go with a phrase; it is ridiculous. Socialism means the social ownership of the means of production and distribution and of exchange; and it means its democratic management. That is what you have got; and that is all you have got. The rank and file of the Socialist Party are ready to move; they want to do something; they are ready to move and the rank and file of the Socialist Party are going to move. We are ready to move and you won't let us move. I am willing to have my mouth sewed up. I am willing to submit to the party discipline; I will try to be a good soldier in the Socialist army; you can silence me; you can hold me; you can chain me; you can fill my mouth with beautiful phrases and say: Repeat them. But our comrades of the rank and file are chafing at the inaction; they are looking for a lead. The movement all over the country is calling for action. Will you lead or will you pursue? We want the class struggle, Comrade Malkiel; we will never cease to fight for it. We want to fight for the working class women; and we will never desert them. But simply because a few women whom I will not mention—they have received undue notoriety here this morning—have gone into the movement, and have been written up by the capitalistic newspapers—is that any reason why we should be indifferent to the struggle of the great mass of the women of America for universal suffrage? I say, no. A thousand times no. There are tens of thousands of women in the United States who have never heard of the Socialist movement. But they are for woman suffrage. And they will be with us yet. They belong to us. It is for us to give them a lead. As that report stands, now, if it does not mean the same as the substitute I am opposed to it. I don't want to work in this movement as an individual. I want to work as a Socialist. I want to go as a member of the Socialist Party. I want to go as a member of the state organization of California. I want to go if there is a national congress of that movement and speak; and if you silence

me and if you tie me, I will submit. I and my comrades will sweat under the collar; we are waiting for powerful, legitimate, consistent, statesmanlike action and leadership; not simply the mouthing of phrases. I ask you to vote for this substitute if it does not conflict with the fundamental principles of the class struggle, and I believe it does not.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): This is a matter of the tactics of one organization, a national organization, in dealing with another national organization. Now the American Woman's Suffrage Association is an organization working for the ballot for women. I say that organization is not a middle class organization. I know that organization is composed of women of all classes. I know that they are simply united on this one issue: the ballot for the women of America. The Socialist Party has pledged itself to work for the emancipation of women. Now, the same thing for this organization to do is to take action on this matter that is consistent with its action on other immediate demands. When the question of free speech came up, we stated that the Socialist Party was in hearty sympathy with the I. W. W. in that fight because they were fighting for one of the fundamentals of the Socialist belief, free speech. The Socialist Party said: "We don't care whether you want political action or not; we are with you in this fight. We are with you in the thing which you want, which is for the interest of the working class." We co-operated with the organization. When the question of the Russian and Mexican refugees came up, the leaders in our organization became officials in the relief organization. That organization was non-political; composed of men and women of all parties, of all races, of all creeds. We took that stand, because the thing they were fighting for was for the interest of the working class. We co-operated with that organization. I hope that when you vote upon this question, which is of great importance to our movement at this time, that you will decide intelligently. I hope you will not be influenced by mere oratory. Strip the points of all sentiment and oratory and decide them intelligently. It is a matter of obliterating class lines for the purpose of working for the thing that the working class wants now. Bear these things in mind and vote for Mrs. Maynard's substitute.

DEL. ESTHER LAUKKI (Minn.): If delegates are going to stand before a Socialist congress and say that we are in

this fight for a sex and not for a class I think that is something we ought not to stand for. I tell you whether Mrs. Belmont or Hetty Green get the ballot or not they will get what they want through the capitalist men.

Now, is this woman suffrage association a political movement, or is it a class movement, or what is it? I have studied the proceedings of their last convention and they show that they are opposed to Socialism. You will find it announced that the suffrage movement has made a great gain in the last year; it has gained the vote for women who pay taxes in Michigan to vote on tax questions. They proclaim that they are for universal suffrage, but they are willing to take a limited suffrage. If they are willing to accept that, we Socialists have nothing to do with them. If we really think this is for the benefit of the workers, all right; let us fight for it. But so far as I have studied the thing I cannot see any benefit in it. Some of the comrades have said here that in Europe the Socialist organizations have fought with the capitalists when it was something in favor of the working class. What has been the attitude of the English Socialists toward their suffrage association? They said they did not want to have anything to do with them. And in Finland we tried to smooth it down. But we found that in the end the capitalist women had nothing for us. We women and men of the Socialist movement want to get the women to understand that it is a class and not a sex problem. Don't let the capitalist women come and agitate with our help among our women. Now, if we are going to tell our women that they can join this suffrage association, it is all right. But, if you accept this substitute, it will put the responsibility on every local in every state to urge their women to join the suffrage association. That is plainly in the amendment as I see it. Read this original report: "Resolved, That the Socialist Party demands equal suffrage, regardless of sex, color or race, and pledges itself to work, advocate and agitate for it." What else do you want? That places us where, if it is brought up in the legislature, we Socialists have the right to stand there as representatives of the Socialist Party and ask for it. If they think it is better to mix up their speeches with ours, that is all right. But if they see there is no benefit, they will not.

Now, I believe in the materialistic conception. A woman is an animal as well

as a man. If you say that woman is more social than man let us go back to the savage. Is she social when she protects her infant from another woman? Is she social when she is protecting her tribe? If another tribe comes against hers, she will kill. Is there any more social instinct in a woman than in a man? It is the class behind it and not the social instinct. Delegate Strelbel made the point of order that inasmuch as the chairman had taken a list of names and had been recognizing speakers from that list it would not be fair to cut off the debate, and that, if any list was kept, an opportunity should be given all delegates to place their names on the list.

The chairman ruled the point not well taken, as he was taking no formal list, but simply keeping himself informed for his own purposes of those who rose and tried to get the floor.

A DELEGATE: Will the previous question shut off debate?

DEL. BERGER: Yes. We have debated this question all last night and all this morning and we have about fifty other subjects to take up. The reporters for the majority report and the mover of the substitute will have their speeches anyway.

DEL. LENA MORROW LEWIS: When it comes to a Socialist convention, with rare exceptions the sex or class lines are obliterated. We work in the Socialist party not as men working against women, nor as women working against men; but as human beings. When we go into the world outside and take part in political and social activities, we are confronted with the fact that women with the exception of four states in the west are disfranchised, and we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that as a sex, the women of New York, of Massachusetts and of Illinois have no vote. Therefore, as women seeking enfranchisement they stand together as women on this one point.

It has been charged here to-day that this suffrage association is a political organization. The woman's suffrage association is not a political party. Political parties have definite programmes, and stand for specific political ends and are always affected by class interests. The woman's suffrage association does not put a political party in the field standing for class interests. And when the argument

is presented, that because, when the Belmonts and the Harrimans and the Hills put up money for the Democratic and Republican parties, they are helping to perpetuate those parties that stand for the present system, therefore the same argument applies to the women who have helped to finance the suffrage movement, that argument is not well founded, because they are helping to place in the hands of the working women of the country the weapon with which they will end the present system. The Woman's Suffrage Association stands for the unlimited, unqualified ballot for women. Any man, therefore, who helps that association, is helping to put an end to the present social system. But if ever the time comes when that association shall stand for a limited suffrage then we cannot unite with them; we cannot co-operate with them. When it came in Illinois to the point where the association had a chance to come out and perhaps get a limited suffrage the state president for Illinois said: "No; we stand for the unlimited suffrage and not for any half loaf; or even a slice. We want all that we stand for, and shall fight until we get it."

In Oklahoma the Democratic party said to the suffrage association: "You can have this measure go through provided you will stand with us on the grandfather clause. Now, the grandfather clause I will explain for the benefit of those of you who never heard of it. The idea is this: That a man or woman cannot vote in Oklahoma unless their grandfather was a voter. That virtually disfranchises the entire colored race. The suffrage association, through its national representative who had been sent to Oklahoma, said to the women there: "I don't know where you stand, but if you stand for this grandfather clause I quit the state of Oklahoma; the National Association will withdraw its support and we shall have nothing to do with you. And the women of the Woman's Suffrage Association of Oklahoma every last one of them stood against that grandfather clause."

So long as this movement is non-partisan; so long as it stands for unlimited, unqualified suffrage, we ought to co-operate with it. And just in proportion as we get the ballot for the working women will they begin to take a greater and greater interest and part in the fight for the triumph of the working class.

So, comrades, we have everything to gain by co-operation so long as that co-

operation does not conflict with our fundamental principles, and so long as we can win the weapon by which we are going to be able to abolish for ever this system.

Delegate Berger here moved the previous question.

The point of order was made that the previous question would shut off the reporters and chairman of the committee. The chairman ruled that it would, but was overruled on appeal.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman, of the committee has the floor to close the debate.

DEL. MAY WOOD-SIMONS: First of all I want to take up the report of this woman's committee and tell you what it really does mean. You have heard it twice and I will not read it to you again. If I am to interpret this report, it means this, and it was so understood by the committee: If you are in the midst of a fight, as Comrade Stitt Wilson says, for the suffrage in California, it does not bar you Socialists from taking part in any public meeting; or prevent you from sending a representation to take part in a legislative demonstration. Nothing of the sort. Comrade Carey asks, would it not shut off such activities as they have had in Massachusetts? Not at all. It simply means that we do wish the Socialist movement to carry on the agitation for the suffrage—not as Comrade Hillquit's resolution would do, shift it more over to the suffrage association and leave the Socialist Party rather apart from it; not at all. We want the Socialist movement engaged in this; but when conditions are as they are in perhaps three-quarters of the states to-day, where no particular bill is before the legislature, when no crisis has been reached, then we want our Socialist women to be working to build up the Socialist Party; and at the same time in building up the Socialist Party, making just so many Socialists. Every time you make a Socialist you make a suffragist.

I am not one who necessarily bows down to the Stuttgart resolutions, but Comrade Hillquit, who presents this report on woman's activities, was one of the delegates who voted for it at the Stuttgart conference. Now, I have read to you this morning what the resolution stands for—the Stuttgart resolution. Comrade Cohen has made the point that the Stuttgart resolution says that we shall not work with other suffrage associations. I take it that the resolution means continuous day to day work; and the resolution

does not make any mention of limited suffrage. If it had done so we should have been in an entirely different position. Now, this report does not shut you off from speaking as individuals on any suffrage platform. I must disagree with Comrade Hillquit, when he says that what we may do as individuals we may do as a party. It is not quite true. Some of us might wish to belong to the Anti-Vaccination League or the Anti-Vivisection League, but we would not ask the party to commit itself on those propositions.

We have in this country a situation very similar to that in Europe. We must work for suffrage in different states. We leave that matter entirely out of our report. It was discussed at great length by the committee, but we believed that the brief statement that we have made covered all the points; and with the interpretation that I have given, I believe it does. Now, in Oregon, I am told that there is a bill pending for limited suffrage on a property qualification for women. We could not co-operate there. We have had exactly the same situation in Illinois. So, when Comrade Hillquit says that the National Association stands for universal suffrage that may be true, but in the states there is a certain autonomy in the suffrage movement, and in one state women may decide to work for a limited suffrage; and under those conditions we cannot co-operate with them. Here, in Illinois, we have been repeatedly asked to go out and support individual Democrats or Republicans who would pledge themselves to work for suffrage in Congress. We cannot do that. When are we to be with and when are we to be against this chameleon like suffrage movement? The Socialist must decide, the Socialist Party must decide in the different localities. Therefore we have left that question entirely out of this report, trusting that the Socialists, in their respective localities would be clear enough when it came to any question of action.

I want to point out this, however. It is said that the National Suffrage Association never stands for anything but unlimited suffrage. I hold in my hand the report of the forty-first convention, and in this report under this introduction it says: "During the year 1908 our cause won four solid victories;" mark the words—"four solid victories; Michigan gave the tax paying women a vote on questions of local taxation; Denmark gave the women who are taxpayers or the wives of tax payers a vote for the

office of member of Parliament." I took that matter before the National Convention of the Woman's Suffrage Association when it met in Chicago; I took that before the resolutions committee personally and asked them to condemn the action taken by the Supreme Court on the Moyer-Haywood-Pettibone case, and they were passing resolutions on various subjects; but they refused to entertain the resolution, refused even to allow it to go on the floor, and no Socialist woman served on any committee, or spoke before that convention.

We cannot speak of the class struggle from the platform of the suffrage association. You cannot wipe away the class struggle among women and say it is just a beautiful sisterhood. There is a struggle there as much as there is among the men. While I will work for the ballot, I have behind me a political party that has pledged itself, and I don't propose as Comrade Hillquit would do, to shift it off the shoulders of the Socialist Party and on to the shoulders of the Suffrage Association. I have back of me a political party that is willing to fight with me in this struggle. Our Comrade Hillquit asked us last night where should we go to get our material? Why are we working for suffrage in our own little group, when we are all suffragists already? But I want to say that if we want the working women, and I take it we do, if we wish them to come to a realization of their real class interests, we shall not do it by talking Socialism to them alone. It is just about as easy to make a Socialist as it is a suffragist. In the state of Colorado the women have the ballot and there they are making just as big a struggle to get the women to understand Socialism, so that they can use their ballot intelligently, as is being made elsewhere to get the ballot for the women.

One more thing. We have already done all of the things that Comrade Stitt Wilson asked if he might be permitted to do. We, as a committee, collected over four thousand petitions and sent them down to Washington—suffrage petitions. We did this as members of the Socialist Party. We stamped at the head of each one: "Collected by the members of the Socialist Party." And that showing of names collected by the Socialist women of the country was one of the most remarkable things at that conference. Comrade Spargo, speaking of Comrade Work's report, said we did not intend to become the tail of some anti-vaccination or some other anti league. Neither do

we wish to become the tail of the Suffrage association. I ask the Socialist women and I ask the Socialist men to fight to attain political equality, but don't do it as the tail of some organization, don't always drag along at the end of something else. But let us lead in this matter.

Shall we dissipate our energies building up an outside organization? You say that in Europe the party co-operates with any party when the crisis comes. Well and good. But they don't spend their energies in building up those organizations first. They co-operate with them in the crises; we do the same. The working woman has only a certain amount of energy to expend; if she spends it in the suffrage movement, she will not spend it in the Socialist movement. While I want the ballot, I don't consider that the great thing; I am fighting for that as a means to a greater thing. If we spend all our time in building up a suffrage movement, then when we have

obtained the ballot we shall have to begin all over again to educate the woman to use that ballot intelligently.

I ask you to vote for the report as it stands. It does not tie your hands in any way whatever. It leaves you the opportunity to work in your own individual localities as the situation may seem to demand. But it does not allow the impression to go out that we, as Socialists, recommend that we should go along in this work in co-operation with the suffrage associations. I know of one woman in our Chicago local, who has brought in thirteen new Socialists in the past six weeks, and that means thirteen new suffragists, if you please.

I ask you to vote for the report as it stands.

Upon a division the amendment of Delegate Maynard was defeated.

The report was then adopted as read. Adjourned until 2:30 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Willert called the Congress to order at two o'clock P. M., and announced that the next order of business would be the report of the special committee elected on the Organization report.

Delegate Work made the point that the report of the Woman's Committee had not yet been completely acted upon.

The Chairman held that the entire report of the committee had been before the Congress, and that the next business in order would be the election of a Woman's Committee of seven members.

ELECTION OF WOMAN'S COMMITTEE.

The following nominations were made as members of the Woman's Committee: J. Stitt Wilson (Calif.), Mila Tupper Maynard (Colo.), May Wood-Simons (Ill.), Winnie E. Branstetter (Okla.), Caroline A. Lowe (Kans.), Lena Morrow Lewis (Cal.), Theresa Malkiel (N. Y.), Maud Thompson (Mich.), Ella Reeve Bloor (Conn.), Elizabeth H. Thomas (Wis.), Esther Laukki (Minn.), Marguerite Prevey (Ohio), Anna Maley (Minn.), Mary E. Garbut (Calif.). The name of J. Stitt Wilson was withdrawn, also the names of Anna Maley, and Ella Reeve Bloor.

Thereupon the regular order of business was resumed after the tellers had collected the ballots and retired to count them.

The Chairman called for the report of the special committee on Organization. Delegate Berger announced that the committee was not yet ready to report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next thing in order would be the report of the committee on the Agricultural problem.

DEL. M'DERMOTT (Mont.): I move that the Committee on Immigration be continued until the next National Convention or Congress, and that it study along the same line laid down by the previous convention, and that it include in its report what bearing unrestricted immigration would be apt to have on the international Socialist movement of the world.

(No second.)

AGRICULTURAL PROBLEM.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next thing in order would be the report of the committee on Agricultural problems.

Delegate A. M. Simons, on behalf of the committee, presented the report on the agricultural question. During the reading of the report Delegate Simons made the following remarks:

DEL. SIMONS: The committee has placed in there the farmers' program of Oklahoma, because that is, as far as I know, the first farmers' program worked out in any state organization, and I feel very certain that the other members of the committee agree with me that the

delegates ought to have that before them, as it is worked out by a larger body, and I believe an equally capable body at least with the members of the committee, on the farmers' question. We do not endorse that in all places, nor do we condemn it everywhere. I have not read over Comrade Lee's recommendations at the close. Those were received separately. We did not work together by mail very successfully. It was rather slow work. Now I will read our suggestions for the farmers' program. I just want to preface that by saying that the statements that

have been made here are largely to show the underlying facts that are necessary to a grasp of the farmers' program. There are great changes taking place in some lines of agriculture, but so far as I am concerned, and so far as a majority of the members of the committee are concerned, we frankly admitted that we did not know what position we were going to take or how we were going to handle it.

Whereupon the reading of the report of the committee was completed. The report is as follows:

REPORT OF FARMERS' COMMITTEE

Although the first draft of this report was submitted to the full committee and the present draft was rewritten largely to meet suggestions made by various members, yet, because there has not been sufficient time to permit a second revision by the entire committee, no one save myself can be held strictly responsible for the matter it contains.

Comrade Algernon Lee also submitted a suggestion towards a report, and since there is no opportunity for revision or discussion his matter is also submitted above his name.

Fraternally,

(Signed) A. M. SIMONS,
Chairman Farmers' Committee.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FARMERS' COMMITTEE.

Unfortunately this report must necessarily be issued before the census of 1910 is completed. Its conclusions must therefore be based largely on observations of general tendencies and not upon statistical data.

The most striking thing about agriculture at the present moment is that it is just entering a new stage. The changes during the past few years have been greater than in many previous centuries. This change is seen not alone in improved farm machinery, although this has played its part. The old extensive system of single crop farming has almost disappeared. This change carries with it the theory based upon the idea that specialized cultivation of large areas would increase until the large farms would swallow up the smaller ones. It is time for Socialists to completely abandon this theory. Fifty years of the most rapid agricultural evolution has produced no sign of any tendency in the direction of such a form of concentration. Farms at the present time are probably smaller per unit of area than ever before. This does not mean that concentration has passed farming by, but only that it has taken on a different form from what Socialists of fifty years ago expected.

The basic feature of the new farming is found in the fact that the farm is becoming an agricultural factory. In all lines of industry the great obstacles to concentration have been found in the uncertainties of the trade and the impossibility of continuous operation. So long as farming was dependent upon the caprices of soil, weather, insects and individual skill, it could never be sufficiently standardized to enable it to follow the course of factory industry.

Progress in all lines of industry consists largely in substituting certainty for chance. This process is now going on very rapidly in agriculture. The new farming is very little dependent upon heat or cold or water of nature. All these can now be supplied artificially, and the introduction of certain and complete control renders the new methods more economical than the free supply of nature.

The soil, once largely the most important element, has ceased to be of any great importance. Soil can now be manufactured, almost to order, and the land furnished little more than a location. It is now a part of the capital of the farmer, and not always even of the fixed capital.

This control of the soil depends largely upon the use of artificial fertilizers, and

here again we seem to be entering upon a new era. While upon most farms the great masss of fertilizing material is still produced on the farm itself, and the use of certain crops for fertilizing purposes is being highly developed, yet the great source of supply is becoming controlled by phosphate and nitrate trusts, and the most important element, nitrogen, is now being produced mechanically by electric plants. Another important source is the Beef Trust, through their utilization of by-products.

The whole irrigation movement is but a part of this change. Wherever water is supplied artificially, the price of the land is so high that it is profitable to practically re-make the soil, if it is not satisfactory.

On the mechanical side, recent changes have tended to develop this same tendency. The production of artificial heat requires a large capital. New standards of purity in dairy products are requiring greater expense and more factory-like organization of the industry.

Another influence working in the same direction is seen in the specialization of farm animals. These are now highly perfected meat producing machines. Almost any agricultural college can furnish a formula giving the exact amount of beef or pork that will be produced from feeding a certain amount of food to certain breeds of animals.

The substitution of other sources of power than that of animals, furthers the same line of progress. So long as any industry is dependent on animal power, it can never attain the factory stage. The use of the gasoline engine promises to have far reaching effect. It furnishes the power which, for the particular purpose of farming, is much more suitable than steam. The portability, simplicity and cheapness of this power make possible its application in many places where steam could never be used.

These mechanical changes are having the same effect in farming that they have in every line of industry. Concentration, while it does not follow the lines at first expected, now promises to follow the parallel line with industrial evolution much more closely. All the changes that have been mentioned greatly increase the amount of capital required for the farm unit.

This tendency is further accelerated by the constant and rapid increase in the price of land, even as a location. This increase is made more rapid by the disappearance of the world frontier. Free land is now a thing of the past, save in the most remote corners of the earth. This has been accompanied by a vast increase of urban population, thus adding still more to the demand for farm products, relative to the number of farmers.

The farm, when transformed into a factory, requires large investments of capital in many directions. Almost any acre of a modern, intensively cultivated market garden requires more capital than was demanded by the even larger farms of a generation ago.

Even the remnant of so-called free land now open requires large capital for its use. The day when penniless pioneers pressed out to the edge of civilization, there to create a farming unit, owned by each one individually, has passed. All the new projects for farmers require a capital such as is possessed by few farmers or wage laborers; consequently the present "Back to the Land" movement is largely one of small capitalists. Indeed, the amount required would not be considered small among capitalists of fifty years ago.

This rise in the price of land is transforming the coming generation of farmers into a race of renters. There is little possibility for resourceless workers to become farm owners. Here, again, the absence of recent statistics makes any definite statement impossible. A straw that suggests the course of events is found in the fact that the population of Iowa, almost the foremost agricultural state in the Union, is the only state showing an absolute decline in population during the last ten years. The state census, taken in 1905, showed this, and the preliminary estimates issued by the United States confirm the fact and show that the movement is of long duration. The local authorities agree that this is due to an increase in the size of the farm unit, a growth in the amount of capital required per farm, due to the rising price of land and the consequent emigration to Canada.

Thus this stage upon which we appear to be just entering presents all the phenomena made familiar in the competitive stage of the factory industry. It would thus appear to be a stage immediately preceding the entrance of great capital and the Trust into farming.

Along with this change is coming the change in the position of the farm laborer as distinct from the farm owner. We are beginning to see the same organization of industry that has long prevailed in the factory. Trained superintendents are being turned out of the Agricultural Colleges, and these are becoming the employers of unskilled men recruited from the city. As yet, this development has not proceeded far enough to present any practical questions for solution. Few things, however, are more striking than the great extension of agricultural education. The nation, state, and in a great many cases smaller political divisions, are constantly extending their activities in this direction.

These things are largely of the future. Little more than their beginnings are with us today. The industry of agriculture is not yet a factory industry, and the majority of the farmers are not yet in a position to accept the factory psychology. Yet, because they are moving in that direction they can be appealed to with Socialist philosophy much more effectively than before such tendencies were visible. Moreover, it is of the greatest importance that the Socialists should themselves be familiar with these new phases if the problems of the farmer are to be met in the Socialist program.

One thing should be well understood, in addition to the fact that the old idea of bonanza farms swallowing all others is not true, and that is that the Socialists of the world are unanimously agreed that no Socialist party proposes the immediate expropriation of the farm owner who is cultivating his own farm. Every European Socialist platform that mentions this subject agrees upon this point.

At the same time it is not for the Socialist party to guarantee the private ownership of any productive property. The laws of evolution forbid any such guarantee so far as it applies to the products of the laborer. So long as tools are used merely by individual handcraftsmen they present no problem of ownership which the Socialist is compelled to solve. The same is true of land. Collective ownership is urged by the Socialist, not as an end in itself, not as a part of a utopian scheme, but as means of preventing exploitation, and wherever individual ownership is an agency of exploitation, then such ownership is opposed by Socialism.

One of the most encouraging phases of recent evolution is the closer relationship arising between farmers and wage-workers. This was inevitable, as they found themselves confronted by the same enemy.

This mutual approach is seen, not alone in the overtures being made to establish direct connection between organizations of farmers and of wage workers. This in itself is but an expression of the increasing identity of interest of the members of these organizations.

It is no longer a question of what the Socialists will do for, or to the farmers. It is doubtful if the question was ever properly stated in this manner. Socialists, least of all, can afford to come forward as saviors of other social classes. The farmers, however, are now definitely moving for themselves. They are moving in great masses and with fairly definite aims. They are going to have a voice in determining the tactics of any working class movement. At the same time it is well for both farmers and wage workers to bear in mind that the latter are the advance guard in the class struggle, that they are the peculiar product of capitalism, and that in every country they have played the part of pathfinders on the road to social revolution.

It is therefore of the greatest significance that within the last few years the farmers have shown a striking tendency to adopt the tactics that have proven successful in the fight of the wage workers. The tactics of the leading farmers' organizations of today are strikingly different from those of a generation ago. The methods pursued by the Farmers' Alliance and the Grange during the '80's are hardly suggested today in the councils of the American Society of Equity and the Farmers' Union.

The farmers' organizations of today seek by means of "controlled marketing" to determine the price of their product by methods familiar in the trade union world. Moreover, they are looking to direct co-operation with the unions in carrying out those methods. In so far as it is possible to do so without compromising Socialist principles, it is absolutely essential that the Socialist party work from the beginning in close co-operation with the efforts of the farmers to resist exploitation. We must not repeat the mistake which was made in the early days of the Socialist movement of this country in our relations with the trades unions.

When it comes to outlining definite steps to be taken by the Socialist party, we

are confronted with a mass of detailed difficulties and forced to recognize that there is no royal road to the goal we are seeking. There is no ready-to-order program that will insure co-operation with the farmers. There is no absolute certainty as to the steps along which we must proceed in this regard. We, in America, are not alone in this indefinite position. It is the position of every European Socialist party, many of which have worked for years upon this problem.

There are some things, however, that the more recent lines of evolution in agriculture would seem to suggest. The largest agricultural units at the present time are not to be found on great farms in remote districts. They are the great vegetable factories at the doors of the largest cities. It is probable that one of the largest farms in the world, measured by the amount of capital invested, is within the limits of the city of Chicago, and which has more than thirty acres under glass with artificial heat. This farm finds it possible to compete in the production of almost all agricultural products, save cereals, with farms located upon the edge of the tropics, or with any farms depending upon natural light, heat, water and soil elements.

The Socialists might well demand that such plant factories as these should be owned and operated by municipal or state governments. It is impossible to tell how far such establishments, if publicly owned, might be developed, and how far they might go toward solving many problems that now confront Socialist management of municipalities. It is also possible that such establishments may prove of value in educational work, and also in meeting the problem of the unemployed.

The demand that there be no further alienation of public lands, already in our platform, should be emphasized, and coupled with the demand that such lands be used, where practicable, for intensive agriculture. The swamp and irrigated lands, which are almost the only ones now in the public possession, are especially suited for this purpose.

The Socialists of other lands are unanimous in encouraging co-operative movements among farmers. These may be extended beyond the marketing of farm products to the ownership of farm machinery, breeding animals and the purchase of fertilizers.

The farmers have always agreed, in their organizations, that they desire government ownership of transportation and storage facilities. They would also welcome the proposal for collective ownership and operation of slaughter houses, packing establishments, and of all trusts that manufacture things used by the farmers.

If the line of evolution that has been referred to above is followed much further, it is probable that the rise in the price of land, making ownership more difficult, the increase in the size of the farm unit caused by the introduction of the factory system into farming and the need of the employment of large numbers of men continuously throughout the year in such establishments, will lead to the organization of farm laborers. Experience in other industries would indicate that this evolution must proceed for some years before such organizations become an important factor in social movements.

One thing that must be recognized by Socialists is, that any program that neglects the largest single division of the producing class can not rightly call itself a working class movement, and is certainly doomed to failure. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance that careful study be given to the question of co-operation with the farmers and that some plan of common action shall be developed.

The Socialists of Oklahoma are almost the only ones in this country who have made any serious effort to solve this problem. For such an effort they are entitled to the gratitude of the Socialists of the entire country. Without in any way giving it endorsement, the program which they have adopted is herewith submitted as offering suggestions born of experience and therefore more worthy of careful consideration than any that might spring from a purely theoretical and doctrinaire knowledge of the subject:

FARMERS' PROGRAM.

As measures calculated to bring into collective property the land, and enable the farmer to have the use and occupancy of the land sufficient for a home and the support of his family, we hereby advocate and pledge our elected officers to the following program:

ARTICLE 1.

Separation of the Department of Agriculture from the political government by means of:

Section 1. Election of all members and officers of the Board of Agriculture by the direct vote of the actual farmers.

Section 2. Introduction of the merit system among the employees.

ARTICLE 2.

Erection by the State of grain elevators and warehouses for the storage of farm products; these elevators and warehouses to be managed by the Board of Agriculture.

ARTICLE 3.

Organization by the Board of Agriculture of free agricultural education and the establishment of model farms.

ARTICLE 4.

Encouragement by the Board of Agriculture of co-operative societies of farmers:

Section 1. For the buying of seed and fertilizer;

Section 2. For the purchase and common use of implements and machinery;

Section 3. For the preparing and sale of produce;

Section 4. For the working of land by groups.

ARTICLE 5.

Organization by the State for loans on mortgages and warehouse certificates, the interest charges to cover cost only.

ARTICLE 6.

State insurance against diseases of animals, diseases of plants, insect pests, hail, flood, storm and fire.

ARTICLE 7.

Aid and encouragement to be given the actual workers of the farms in the formation of District Co-operative Associations which shall be given the power to issue bonds for the purchase of suitable farming lands—bonds to be redeemable in forty years. Individuals purchasing such lands shall pay the purchase price of land in share or cash annual or semi-annual rentals extending over a period of forty years, or may at their option pay in full in any given number of years.

ARTICLE 8.

Exemption from taxation and execution of dwellings, tools, farm animals, implements and improvements to the amount of one thousand dollars.

ARTICLE 9.

A graduated tax on the value of rented land and land held for speculation.

ARTICLE 10.

Absentee landlords to assess their own lands, the state reserving the right to purchase such lands at their assessed value plus ten per cent.

ARTICLE 11.

Land now in the possession of the state or hereafter acquired through purchase, reclamation or tax sales to be rented to landless farmers under the supervision of the Board of Agriculture at the prevailing rate of share rent or its equivalent. The payment of such rent to cease as soon as the total amount of rent paid is equal to the value of the land, and the tenant thereby acquires for himself and his children the right of occupancy. The title to all such lands remaining with the commonwealth.

SUGGESTIONS OF COMRADE LEE.

Throughout the greater part of the history of the United States (except in the South, where the existence of slavery produced special conditions, some of which have continued after the emancipation of the slaves), the generally prevalent type of agricultural producer was one which closely corresponded to that of the self-employed artisan in the field of industrial production. The typical American farmer was a man who owned, free of mortgage, a farm of moderate size, large enough to require for its cultivation practically all of his labor time, but not so large as to necessitate the employment of hired labor except on a small scale in busy seasons.

Under the influence of technical changes in industrial production, transportation, and exchange, the industrial artisan has become practically extinct, giving place

to the employing capitalist and the wage worker. The technical evolution of agriculture has gone on somewhat more slowly and under somewhat different forms. An examination of the available statistics, however, as well as common observation, shows that a series of changes are taking place, by which the classic type of American farmer is being displaced and new categories of agricultural producers are arising, with economic interests and social tendencies essentially different from those of the farmers above described.

A comparison of the census statistics of the year 1900 with those of 1890 and of earlier decades, shows that both large and small farms are increasing in proportionate number at the expense of those of moderate size. In 1890, the farms of less than 50 acres were about 29 per cent of the whole number of farms in the United States; in 1900, they numbered almost 34 per cent of the whole. The farms of 500 acres or more numbered 2.5 per cent of the whole in 1890 and 2.6 per cent in 1900. In 1890, out of every thousand farms in the United States, 289 were of less than 50 acres; in 1900, such small farms numbered 337 out of every thousand. The farms of 500 acres or more numbered 25 out of every thousand in 1890 and 26 out of every thousand in 1900. The number of farms between 50 and 500 acres was reduced during this period from 686 to 637 out of every thousand. The increase in small farms took place in every section of the country; the increase of large farms took place all over the North and West, but was partly counterbalanced by a reduction in the number of large farms in the South; the proportionate number of farms of medium size took place in all sections.

In 1890, out of every thousand farms, 284 were cultivated by tenants paying a rental in cash or on shares, and 716 were cultivated by their owners. In 1900, the number of rented farms had increased to 353, and the number cultivated by their owners had fallen to 647 in the thousand. The same tendency showed itself alike in the North, the South, and the West.

The proportion of farm families occupying mortgaged homes rose from 186 in the thousand in 1890 to 200 in the thousand in 1900. This change also seems to have taken place in all sections of the country alike.

In 1890, out of every thousand males at least ten years of age in the United States, 324 were reported as being engaged in agricultural pursuits. In 1900, the proportion was 317 out of every thousand. The statistics for previous decades, though they are less trustworthy than those for 1890 and 1900, confirm the impression that the agricultural population is declining in proportionate numbers. This decline, however, is very slow. The agricultural population will undoubtedly for many decades continue to constitute at least 30 per cent of the whole population of the country.

The composition of this agricultural population, however, is undergoing noteworthy changes. Socialist writers and speakers have been too prone to lump together the whole agricultural population as a single class, under the general designation of "farmer," or even to throw them indiscriminately together with small tradesmen, business men, and professional persons, as constituting the "middle class." This classification is entirely misleading. The small capitalists in industry and commerce have economic interests and social tendencies very different from those of the agricultural elements. Nor does the agricultural population itself constitute one homogeneous class. On the contrary, it is divided into perhaps as many classes as are to be found in industrial society, though the class lines may not be quite so clearly drawn. We have to note the distinction between farmers and hired farm workers. The hired workers may be distinguished into at least two groups; the one represented by the old-fashioned "hired man," who is ordinarily the sole employee on a small or middle-sized farm where he works year after year, living with his employer virtually as one of the family; the other represented by the laborers of the Northwest, who work in gangs at harvesting, threshing, and other farm work part of the year, passing from farm to farm till the season is over, then in many cases going to work in the lumber camps during the winter, and perhaps passing from that to railway construction work the next year. The farmers, again, fall into several groups according to the size of their farms, the tenure by which they hold them (as free owners, as owners subject to mortgage, or as cash or share tenants), and according to the nature of the agricultural production which they carry on (whether for a local or an extended market; whether turning out a varied product or a special one; whether requiring much or little capital other than the land itself and many or few wage workers).

The changes in area and tenure of farms have already been noted—the increase

of tenancy and of mortgages and the decline in the proportion of middle-sized farms. While the use of machinery in agriculture proper has by no means had such revolutionary results as in the field of industrial production, and while the growth of large farms is very slow and their total number still comparatively small, yet both these factors and certain others have combined to cause a considerable increase in the employment of wage labor in agriculture.

The census of 1890 indicates that out of every thousand males engaged in agriculture, 342 were wage workers, and the census of 1900 indicates a proportion of 415 wage workers out of every thousand. In both years the proportion is probably somewhat too high, as the census undoubtedly classifies as "agricultural laborers" many farmers' sons working on their father's places, who are not wage workers in the strict sense of the term. It may be presumed, however, that this error would be about the same in both years, and that the increase from 342 to 415 accurately enough indicates the ratio in which the employment of wage labor in agriculture increased during the decade in question.

We thus have three antagonisms of economic interest in the field of agricultural production—the antagonism between tenant and landlord, between mortgagor and mortgagee, and between wage worker and employer; and all of these antagonisms are increasing in importance, with the increase in the number of tenants, or mortgagors, and of wage workers.

But this by no means exhausts the list of economic antagonisms in this field. Even more important, for the present, are those between the farmers (whether owners or tenants) and certain great capitalist interests.

With the partial exception of market gardeners and dairy and poultry farmers in the immediate neighborhood of cities of moderate size, all farmers are largely at the mercy of the railway companies and the owners of wheat elevators and other warehouses for the transportation and storage of their produce. As individual small shippers, they are practically helpless in face of the enormously rich and closely combined capitalist corporations which stand between them and their market. With the growth of the very large cities, which can not be supplied from within a radius of a few miles, even the producers of milk, poultry, eggs, vegetables and fruits are becoming more and more dependent upon such powerful middlemen. The producers of special products—cattle, sheep and swine, tobacco, sugar cane and sugar beets, etc.—are in an even worse position, since the concentration of industry has left them with virtually but a single purchaser in each of these lines—the Meat Trust, the Tobacco Trust, the Sugar Trust, etc., which are able to fix prices that leave them little if anything more than the barest subsistence wage for their labor after paying the cash expenses of operating their farms. Finally, all farmers have to purchase machinery and supplies, and here again the concentration of industry leaves them with virtually but a single seller in each line—the Harvester Trust, the Fertilizer Trust, the Cordage Trust, etc.—which can extort from them a monopoly price for everything they have to buy in order to carry on their farms.

1. The national ownership of the land has no place in our program of immediate demands. Whether, fifty or a hundred years hence, it will be found socially desirable that the land should be held as national property, that it should be held under some other form of social ownership, or some portions of it should be held as social property and other portions as the property of individuals, may be an interesting subject for academic discussion. If the technical evolution of agricultural production follows the same course as has been followed in industrial production, the time will undoubtedly come when some form of social ownership will be found necessary—ownership by the nation, by the states, by subdivisions of the states, or by co-operative societies. But for the present there is hardly even the beginning of such an evolution. Agricultural production is still essentially individual production by hand labor. The changes which have taken place in the economics of agriculture are the results chiefly of concentration in the processes of transportation and exchange and in industrial production; only to a very slight degree of the socialization of the processes of agricultural production itself. In the field of industry, what the Socialist movement demands is the social ownership and control of the SOCIALLY OPERATED means of production, not of ALL means of production. Only to a very small extent is the land now, only to a very small extent is it likely to be for many years to come, a socially operated means of production. Even to declare in any dogmatic manner that all the land must eventually become social property is

somewhat utopian; to demand that the ownership of all land shall be immediately socialized is to make ourselves ridiculous.

2. On the other hand, we should include in our immediate demands the retention by the nation and by the states respectively of such lands as they still own, and especially of forest lands, arid lands whose cultivation requires a centralized system of irrigation, etc.

3. In the interest, both of the farmers as producers and of the rest of the population as purchasers, we should lay emphasis upon the demand for the national ownership of the railways and the establishment by the nation (and, pending that, by any states in which we may have sufficient influence to effect it) of a system of public warehouses for the storage of all kinds of agricultural produce, the storage charges to be only sufficient to cover cost of operation and replacement, by which the farmer will be able to come into a more nearly direct relation with the consumers of his produce and to get a higher price for it while even reducing the price to the consumers.

4. We should encourage the formation of co-operative societies of various kinds—societies for the co-operative operation of creameries, cheese factories, and other productive enterprises of a simple nature which draw their raw materials directly from the farms; societies for the co-operative ownership of agricultural machinery and the co-operative purchase of fertilizers, binding twine, implements, and supplies of all sorts; and also societies of wage workers in the cities for the co-operative purchase of provisions and other goods, which can enter into relation with the farmers' societies and partially eliminate middlemen's profits, while at the same time cultivating a mutual understanding and sympathy between the industrial and the agricultural producers. This subject of co-operation should be worked out carefully, on the basis especially of European experience, in order to avoid the danger of the co-operative societies degenerating into mere business enterprises and to develop their socialistic tendencies.

5. We should have a series of special booklets and leaflets prepared for propaganda among the farmers, explaining in clear language the attitude of the Socialist movement, the benefits which it offers them, and the futility of their looking to either of the old parties for relief, or hoping to advance their interests by the organization of a new farmers' party without the aid of the wage workers.

6. We should seriously consider the practicability of carrying on a work of propaganda and organization among the agricultural wage workers—not the individual farmhands of the old type, but the actual proletarians who play so large a role in the agriculture of the Western States.

(Signed) ALGERNON LEE.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FARMERS' PROGRAM

1. Whether, fifty or a hundred years hence, it will be found socially desirable that the land should be held as national property, that it should be held under some other form of social ownership or some portions of it should be held as social property and other portions as the property of individuals, may be an interesting subject for academic discussion. In the field of industry, what the Socialist movement demands is the social ownership and control of the SOCIALLY OPERATED means of production, not of ALL means of production. Only to a very small extent is the land now, only to a very small extent is it likely to be for many years to come, a socially operated means of production. Even to declare in any dogmatic manner that all the land must eventually become social property is somewhat utopian; to demand that the ownership of all land shall be immediately socialized is to make ourselves ridiculous.

2. With the writers of the Communist Manifesto we agree in the principle of the "application of all rents of land to public purposes." To this end we advocate the taxing of all lands to their full rental value, the income therefrom to be applied to the establishment of industrial plants for the preparing of agricultural products for final consumption, such as packing-houses, canneries, cotton gins, grain elevators, storage and market facilities.

3. We should include in our immediate demands the retention by the nation and by the state respectively of such lands as they still own, and such as they may hereafter secure by reclamation, purchase, condemnation or otherwise:

such land to be organized into model state farms and various forms of collective agricultural enterprises, as far and as fast as practical under capitalistic development.

4. In the interest both of the farmers as producers and of the rest of the population as purchasers, we should lay emphasis upon the demand for the national ownership of the railways and the establishment by the nation (and, pending that, by any states in which we may have sufficient influence to effect it) of a system of public warehouses for the storage of all kinds of agricultural produce, the storage charges to be only sufficient to cover cost of operation and replacement, by which the farmer will be able to come into a more nearly direct relation with the consumers of his produce and to get a higher price for it while even reducing the price to the consumers.

ENCOURAGING CO-OPERATION.

5. We should encourage the formation of co-operative societies of various kinds—societies for the co-operative operation of creameries, cheese factories, and other productive enterprises of a simple nature which draw their raw materials directly from the farms; societies for the co-operative ownership of agricultural machinery and the co-operative purchase of fertilizers, binding twine, implements, and supplies of all sorts; and also societies of wage-workers in the cities for the co-operative purchase of provisions and other goods, which can enter into relation with the farmers' societies and partially eliminate middle-men's profits, while at the same time cultivating a mutual understanding and sympathy between the industrial and the agricultural producers. This subject of co-operation should be worked out carefully, on the basis especially of European experience, in order to avoid the danger of the co-operative societies degenerating into mere business enterprises and to develop their socialistic tendencies.

6. The creation of a system of state credit for the purpose of loaning money direct to farmers without the intervention of private banks. It is possible that this may at least partially be covered by the extension of the co-operative movement to the field of banking.

7. State and national insurance against diseases of animals or plants, insect pests and natural calamities.

8. We should have a series of special booklets and leaflets prepared for propaganda among the farmers, explaining in clear language the attitude of the Socialist movement, the benefits which it offers them, and the futility of their looking to either of the old parties for relief or hoping to advance their interests by the organization of a new farmers' party without the aid of the wage workers.

9. We should seriously consider the practicability of carrying on a work of propaganda and organization among the agricultural wage workers—not the individual farm hands of the old type, but the actual proletarians who play so large a role in the agriculture of the Western States.

BY THE COMMITTEE.

DEL. SIMONS: I move the adoption of the committee's report. (Seconded.) I hope you will allow me about three minutes, not to argue.

WOMAN'S COMMITTEE.

The tellers then reported the vote on the Woman's Committee, as follows: Lewis, 46; Simons, 69; Branstetter, 69; Lowe, 51; Malkiel, 59; Prevey, 58; Laukki, 45; Maynard, 45.

The vote for Delegates Laukki and Maynard being a tie, on motion the vote was decided by a show of hands, resulting as follows: Laukki, 42; Maynard, 28.

DEL. AMERINGER: Not now.

DEL. BURKE (N. H.): I am one of those delegates who have taken up but little of the congress' time, and I am not going to speak at any great length on the farmers' program. What I would like, would be to hear the actual workers in the agricultural districts speak upon this question, and let the comrades, that do not know anything about the question, keep still for a little while. This congress is costing me about \$6 a day. I work as a carpenter, and, of course, you know a carpenter cannot afford to lose five or six dollars a day. I want to get back to the old Granite State, and I hope the people that know something about this question will do the talking and that the others will keep still. (Applause.)

DEL. CLYDE J. WRIGHT (Neb.): A point of information. Do I understand that this last document read by Comrade Simons, constitutes what this congress goes on record as endorsing as a farmers' program?

DEL. SIMONS: It is simply a series of recommendations. I could not say that it will constitute a part of our platform. It is simply a report of the committee, and its recommendations, unless put in the platform, would not, according to my understanding, bind the Socialist Party. I may be mistaken, and frequently have been, but those are suggestions. I do not believe the committee have gone far enough to know where they stand.

DEL. WRIGHT: Then, on what kind of a record will this conference be placed when we go back and talk about the action of this body? What will we say we have done? Simply suggested? Is that the idea?

DEL. SIMONS: I think that is all. You cannot place it in the platform unless the platform committee does something. That is the only committee that has power to bind us.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): I want to state that I am a member of a farmers' grange, and I know something of the development of the great farms of the west. I have been a member of a grange for the last three or four years, and I get the bulk of my living out of agricultural products. I want to say that the farmers' grange of the west is to-day breaking loose from its old political surroundings, and that we ought to take some more definite position than this on this question, either by some different resolution or something else, possibly; because the farmers' movement is, I believe, something it never was before, and has not been in the state of Colorado. It is breaking loose everywhere, and if

we do not consider this question a little more seriously we are liable to make a mistake in the near future, especially when you see such a gathering as the one in St. Louis last week, showing that the farmers are looking towards political action.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): Will you allow me to make a suggestion? It occurs to me that we can get through with that very quick under the rule, if you will remember that the best we can do in this congress is to make some general suggestions, and then let each state work out its programme as the Oklahoma comrades have done. If you will endorse a general proposition such as the report presents, and then leave it to each State, you will find that each State has a different practical agricultural problem, and you will perceive that Oklahoma has worked out its programme, and we have printed that in the report.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): A point of information. Do you mean the suggestion as to the farmers' programme?

DEL. THOMPSON: No, I mean the general report of the committee.

DEL. KAPLAN: I would like to see some suggestions endorsed, but I for one would not stand for that part where it says what we are going to have fifty or one hundred years hence. Now, I take the position as a materialist Socialist, that we will have Socialism realized before fifty or a hundred years hence, and that this congress ought not to go on record as waiting for fifty years hence for such a proposition. There is something else to be done than that.

DEL. AMERINGER (Okla.): Friends and Comrades, everybody came to this congress to get something. It is a kind of a family reunion. One of the boys wants a new typewriter when he goes home, and one of the girls wants to get married, just as the boys from Oklahoma want a land programme. Now, we have worked out a Socialist programme to the satisfaction of the Oklahoma movement. Our movement is composed of at least 90 per cent farming farmers, I do believe, Comrades, and the reason why we brought that up here before you was to get the opinions of some of the wise men on this Oklahoma programme. But I see no one who has a better thing than we have got, and so I will just talk on it for a very few minutes.

In the first place, friends, we have in the past accepted the idea that the agricultural industry would be concentrated and hammered down and boiled down until we have great financial farms, owned

by a few capitalists and operated by hundreds of thousands of wage slaves. I want to say to you, friends, that in the United States of America there is not the slightest symptom that that sort of evolution in agriculture is taking place. We have two tendencies in agriculture, one forward towards capitalism, and the other backward toward feudalism, and the principal tendency, I might say nine-tenths of the tendency, is not onward towards capitalism, but backward towards feudalism. I mean in the ownership of land by a master class; the worker on the land being exploited just as the feudal serf was exploited by his lord. The land is not passing into the hands of the large capitalist class. The land is passing into the hands of the small fry capitalists. We find that between 1880 and 1900 farm renters, that is, cash renters, increased from 8 to 13 per cent. From 1880 to 1900 we find the share renters increased from 17 to 22 per cent. We find that in the same twenty years the mortgaged farmer has increased from 53 to 55 per cent. We find everywhere that the soil is passing into the hands of the small fry capitalist class, and that the land is owned by the capitalistic financial bosses to exploit the renting class.

Now, it is the aim of the Oklahoma movement to do three things. Fundamentally the Socialist stands for this one thing: To give to the working people the product of their labor. Incidentally we want the ownership by the working people of the means of production. What we Socialists want to do is to bring about a union, a marriage between ownership and labor. We want this marriage between ownership and labor in order to give the working class the product of their labor. In the case of the farming farmer there is a perfect union, there is a perfect marriage between ownership and labor. That farmer owns the means with which he makes his living. The Socialist would not disturb that relationship. In the case of the farmer who farms the farm the Socialist movement has no right to interfere with that relationship. But just as the shoemaker and the cabinet-maker have lost their means of life, so the farmer is losing his means of life. Now, the question for the Socialist Party is this: Shall we Socialists stand still; shall we be indifferent to the change of the farmer from an owner into a renter, or shall we do something in that respect? Now, the farmer is exploited in three ways. First, he is exploited by the owners of the large means of production and distribution. He is exploited through the

usury of the banks that are farming the farmer, and he is exploited by the owner of the land. Now, what we Socialists want to do is to put an end to exploitation. Do we not? Therefore, we want the farmers to own the farms. We want them to be the owners of the means of production. We want to make it so that the farmer also can get the use of capital without being robbed by a usury class.

I believe that the proposition of your committee covers this in a broad manner. In Oklahoma, we have 60 per cent of all our farmers renters. The programme here would bring about a condition where it would be impossible for the man who does not work land to own land, and it would improve the condition of our 200,000 renters in Oklahoma at least thirty per cent. That is a thing that is worth while striving for. Many of the farmers in the southwest, where I am acquainted, have a good many co-operatively managed enterprises. They have started co-operative general stores, they have started co-operative mills, and they are going into the co-operative business down there. The farmer is recognizing the fact that he must be the owner of all the means with which he works.

Now, what do we Socialists want to do? Do we want the common ownership of all land? No. What for? We have the common ownership of land in Oklahoma — of three million acres of school land. It is common property, and the farmer is a renter on the state land. The relationship is the most unsatisfactory you can imagine, for the farmer does not hold the land long enough to improve it by dwellings. All he does, is to exploit the soil and then move off afterwards. He has not created a home on the exploited soil. We do not want that, if we can help it. That common ownership of land we had in one way among our Indians down Oklahoma. The thing we want to do is to give the land to the man who uses the land. The fellow who doesn't use land—God bless his heart, he doesn't need any. The fellow who uses land as a means of exploitation is a pure and unadulterated holdup man. The landlord class is furnishing the land. If that class never had been born there wouldn't be any land. (Laughter.) If the land owners of the United States would die to-night and go to heaven they would take the land down with them, and there would be a hole in the ground where their land used to be. If there is one class of people that absolutely fulfills no social function whatever, it is the landlords. The industrial capitalist as manager and

superintendent has done something and is doing something, but the landlord does absolutely nothing. He is a block in the wheel of progress. He must be eliminated. (Applause.)

Let us make the fight clean and clear between the landless farmers and the farmer who farms the farmer. We in Oklahoma want every farmer who owns land and farms his land to keep it, and the more he works and produces, the better for us, and the more he improves it the better for mankind. We want him to hang on to it. All we want to do is to do away with the fellow who furnishes the land to the farmer; that gentleman who, like the promoters, furnish the ocean provided the others furnish the ship. (Laughter.)

Now, on this proposition we have a great fight all over the United States, for I believe you have a renters' problem in Illinois; that I do know. I am satisfied that half of your farmers in Illinois are renters to-day. You will find in Wisconsin, where we have a foreign population, that a great many of the farmers up there are renters. Now, if you eliminate the landlord class, if you make the fight against the land owner, whom have you got lined up against you? Somebody that nobody loves. Nobody cares anything for the landlord. He is even a parasite on the industrial capitalists. And if we can divide the opposing forces, if we can divide the capitalist class into the industrial class and the land owning class, let us lick one division at a time instead of butting into both of them at the same time.

Friends, I ask you to adopt this report. We would like to go back to Oklahoma and keep on working with our programme. It is not perfect. We will make it better and better all the time. Each state should try to do the same thing, for I do believe that, if you fight it out on the broad line of "Land for the landless, and he who doesn't use land doesn't get any," that you are going to have the farmers who farm the farms, the renters who rent the farms, and the working people in the towns, and every fair-minded man who does not make his living through the exploitation of the landless man, on your side. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I would like to ask the last speaker, when was the last piece of land thrown open to the public in Oklahoma? He says that 60 per cent of the land workers there are land poor. I would like to get that point so that I can make an argument among the workers in the east.

DEL. AMERINGER: I can explain that very easily. In the first place, half of Oklahoma is the old Indian Territory. In the Indian Territory the land belonged to the Indians until a few years ago, when Congress removed the restriction on the land and the Indians can sell the land. Now, when it came to the time for the Indian to sell his land, it turned out that he had sold it five, six, seven, eight times over before the restriction ever was removed. That Indian, who was not acquainted with this beautiful institution of the private ownership of mother earth, didn't know any better, so when the white man would come along with a jug of whiskey or half a hog the Indian would give that man a chunk of that land. The Indian always had an idea that the land belonged to the same fellow who owned the air and water and sunshine. In Oklahoma these fellows began to buy the land and lease the land of the Indians before the restriction was removed. Now they have got the title, and some of those fellows have the title to some of the best Indian land. The renters on the Indian lands used to fare pretty well with the Indians, who didn't know anything about the beauties of Christian civilization and didn't think it was right to ask anybody anything for the use of that land, and so when any one would ask for it he would let the fellow have the land. But just as soon as the other man, the civilized Christian, got hold of the land the renter began to fare differently. As long as the Indian owned the land the white man got his land reasonable. Now the Indian doesn't have it, the white man owns it, and he squeezes the life out of the renter. This is responsible for the rebellion down in Oklahoma. That is the economic basis for our great Socialist movement in that state.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I believe I voice the sentiments of the committee when I say so far as I am concerned, and I think the others will agree, that we do not care to make any fight on this question. We would rather it would simply be laid on the table. The report is simply put before you for your consideration. However, if you insist on a discussion, all right; I shall never fight to prevent it. It is simply putting something before you that represents the position of the committee.

DEL. MORGAN: I wish to discuss this because I want to see whether we want to adopt peasant proprietorship, the same as they have in Ireland. I am opposed to it. I am in favor of standing by

the Socialist programme. I am opposed to private ownership of land in Chicago, in Oklahoma, or anywhere else. (Applause.) I want to call your attention to the fact here that this recommendation in this report deals absolutely with private property, private owners of land, at least, and it is introduced to save them from extinction and to try to link this great class with the Socialist movement, and there is no mention made of the wage workers who help to cultivate this land. I was very much interested in the talk of the comrade that comes from this new state in the west, Oklahoma. I have hardly got acquainted with him, but at least the comrade interests me. But if these are the recommendations, I am opposed to them. A lot of new men, that have just become private property owners, that have organized to protect themselves, have decided, mind you, that the wage workers in those states shall be treated as servants. The Socialist Party is organized for the purpose of abolishing the relationship of master and man and the wage system, not organized to keep up the establishment of master and man, either in the business or industrial production or in the business of agriculture. We want private property wiped out for the farmer as well as for every other class. I want to tell you that away back in the Irish land agitation Michael Davitt and the other Irishmen organized the Land League, and I and other Englishmen in Chicago, removed 4,000 miles, became their voluntary aids, mind you, and we sent \$1,700 over to Ireland to aid Michael Davitt's programme of abolishing private property in land. And when Parnell came here with his programme of peasant proprietorship the Socialists of Chicago had a parade 50,000 strong and a mass meeting repudiating Parnell and all his peasant proprietorship and standing for the abolition of private property in land. And now, twenty years later, we have got a Socialist convention that is going to support the little farmers in Oklahoma and forget the wage workers who work the farms. (Applause.)

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I did intend to move the previous question, but I will not do it under the circumstances. I cannot accept the report of this committee. I cannot accept this report of this committee as a member of the Socialist Party. I do not believe in the right of ownership of private property to the detriment of society. That is what, as I understand, this report will imply. The comrade from Oklahoma says we want the farms to be

farmed by the men who own the farms. Now, I do not want the farmers to own the farms any more than I want the masters to own the private penitentiaries that you are compelled to work in. Part of the farmers own all the farms under the capitalist system. The men that work the farms get very little of them. We find that the United States Census report states there are 20,264,286 farming farmers in this country. We contend as Socialists that our unit of production to-day will be equivalent to \$3,000. If we stood for the programme of private ownership of farms and that the farmer should get the product of his farm to-day, the amount he would get on the present basis would be about \$1,800, so that you are beating him out of \$1,200 on a reasonable basis under the co-operative commonwealth. I do not believe that the Socialist movement, including all of its elements, has given the land question sufficient study to definitely determine our attitude in this congress. I do not believe the members of this committee will disagree with that position. But to go on record as standing for any element in society, especially that which society as a whole must depend upon for its life, the land, I positively will not vote for it. In conclusion, I trust that some one will move a continuation, and if necessary an enlargement of this committee for the serious study of this question, and to bring back a more favorable and better report to a future convention. But I trust that this congress, in the moment or in the period of an impulsive act, will not vote for the private ownership of anything. If we do we may just as well go out of business, and say that we stand for private ownership of all the means of life with a view of having a number of exploiters instead of a few as we have it to-day.

DEL. T. J. LEWIS (Ore.): Why don't we get up also a document, saying that we believe in the private ownership of shop, mill and factory? We might as well do it. What are you going to do? Are you going to try and bring the farmer and the wage worker together? Do you know to-day that the greatest battle on the coast is not between the foreigner and the American? The greatest battle on the coast to-day is between the farmer and the wage worker. I will tell you about the farmer. Don't play too strong into his hands. When the farmer wants help, who is the greatest enemy to organized labor, but the farmer? He is the fellow that will reduce wages. He is the

fellow that encourages employment offices and agents upon the coast. He is the fellow that will go and fight the poor working man along the railroad. He is the fellow that gets enacted a little statute to crush workingmen and get them into jail, and then come back to work them on the farms. That is the fellow. (Applause.) And I will tell you, you want to watch what you are doing to endorse Oklahoma. You may as well endorse the little business man. If the working class has got any enemy at all in the United States it is the farmer and the business man. Why, the idea!! What is this? Have you come to be reformers?

It looks that way. I thought we represented the working class.

We are supposed to represent the bourgeoisie, and we don't represent them, and I am afraid we don't represent anything. Very true indeed, we do not. Why? Because we are too cowardly, too mean to represent anything. That is true. We are afraid to be men and women. Why? We want to toady to the farmer, we want to toady to the sky pilot, we want to toady to the little business man, we want to be respectable. To hell with your respectability. (Applause.) I say that this is a revolutionary party and stands for the proletaire and the working class. What are you going to do? Play like a lot of parrots? Play to Mrs. Belmont and August Belmont? Is that what you want? The idea of such a thing; I never heard anything like it. I will tell you, anybody that is connected with the working class who would try to endorse a thing like that, I say, take your book and tear it up and throw your button in the ditch. I don't belong to the working class if you endorse a thing like that. (Applause.)

DEL. KUMMERFELD (Mich.): After listening to the report of the committee and after the talk from the comrade from Oklahoma, one is led to believe that in the entire states of the United States where we have farms there is not a single solitary laborer employed upon the farms. One is led to believe that, as the report does not mention the farm laborer, the attitude of the party toward the farm laborer was one of indifference.

A DELEGATE: Yes, it is in the last sentence.

DEL. KUMMERFELD: You cannot find it. You use about ten inches for the farmer, and then you have it down below there somewhere where it is pretty hard to find. It doesn't amount to anything anyway. Now, I am going to ask the comrade from Oklahoma about what per-

centage of the farmers in that state employ farm laborers?

DEL. AMERINGER: I can answer that. We have in Oklahoma itself no farm labor problem. Our farmers do not employ labor.

DEL. KUMMERFELD: We have it, then. Now, I would like to know further what percentage of the farm owners of the United States employ farm labor, and about how many farm laborers are employed upon the farms of the United States. Absolutely there is a problem there. That is the proposition that ought to have been reported upon to this congress and not our attitude toward the farm owners. I don't care a snap for them.

DEL. CLYDE J. WRIGHT (Neb.): I believe that I have a right to talk upon this question. I have not tired you with my presence heretofore, chiefly for the reason that I was waiting for this programme to be brought up. I am the lone representative of the Socialist party from the greatest agricultural state in the Union, the state of Nebraska.

A DELEGATE: How about Kansas?

DEL. WRIGHT: Well, we might match on that, but I will not concede it until you show me. Now then, I do not feel competent to discuss all phases of the Socialist movement that have been presented here. The question of immigration was a question I did not understand. Therefore I kept my mouth shut. The question of agriculture is a question which I believe I do understand. In our state we have a Socialist Party, not the largest, but just as solid, just as progressive, just as revolutionary as that of any other state of the Union. Of the dues-paying membership of that state, 90 per cent are farmers. We have raised in the state of Nebraska during the last fifteen months over \$4,000 in money for the propagation of Socialism, and 94 per cent of it came from farmers. (Applause.) In our convention in Lincoln last year, if you could have been there you would have heard clean-cut, revolutionary Socialism, where 90 per cent of the delegates to that convention were farmers. If you think you can go out into the agricultural districts of the state of Nebraska and hand the farmer a sop, you are going to be mistaken. He has read. In the western country we have the progressive element of the farmer population of the United States. The conservative easterner on the farm stayed at home. In the western farmer's home you will find newspapers and books, the best on the So-

cialist philosophy. He goes into town as up-to-date as the residents of any city of the west, who are just as up-to-date as those of any city of the east. He is informed on these questions. And I want to say this, that I was also pleased, and it was true with our vote on the immigration problem: That the logical thing for this body to do, instead of men standing up on their feet and talking about the farmer programme and suggesting to this congress that they are not able to decide, they should at least be able to say something educational themselves. I do not believe we are prepared to handle this problem. Honestly, I do not. I believe it would be the logical method of procedure to let this lie over, because such arguments as have been presented in the main on this question indicate an utter lack of appreciation of the economic problem of the farmer. He constitutes a wonderfully large percentage of our voting population, and in the west he is the most devoted and enthusiastic supporter of the Socialist programme. To say that this farmer is a traitor to the working class movement of the Socialist Party is an infamous lie. (Applause.) The farmer I am talking about is the farmer who is a Socialist. There may be farmers who would scab on you by coming into town, and you have got them without coming into town. There may be farmers who do not carry out all the ideas of boosting so much in vogue in the commercial world to-day, but I want to tell you that when you brand the Socialist farmer as that kind of an individual you are telling an absolute untruth.

A DELEGATE: Who branded them that way?

DEL. WRIGHT: Comrade Lewis.

A DELEGATE: Nothing of the kind.

DEL. WRIGHT: He did not make any exception. He said the farmer. Now, then, to understand this problem is not a matter of a few minutes' study. You have got to confront the situation, not only by book education, but by actual experience and contact with the farmers themselves. (Applause.) Statistics tell you absolutely no story on this problem at all. You cannot intelligently comprehend it until you have actual contact with their particular environment, just the same as any iron worker in this house will say to the farmer that you cannot comprehend the situation and the environment of the iron worker until you live among your tenement districts or make a personal investigation of his

surroundings. I do not know that I am going to make an argument in favor of the programme or against it. I really believe that the proper course of procedure for us to take at this time is to leave this matter lie over until you have studied it more, until the committee has studied it more. Furthermore, the committee has told the truth in this: That it is hardly possible to define the economic form that the farmer problem is going to take. It is simply commencing to travel upon the road of its particular evolution, and that evolution seems to be tending in just as many different directions as we have different particular environments. Every farmer who comes here to speak upon this question to-day—and you watch the farmer who speaks, not the industrial man, he is not yet sufficiently informed, just as the farmer is not informed on the industrial problem—but you will see in the argument of every farmer coming from the different directions, reflected an argument that points out a different agricultural problem, different in its makeup and pursuing a different course. Out in Nebraska we have the peculiar development of the exporting merchant, the harvester machine agent, the feeder, the ranchman, the farmer, the hog raiser and the politician all blended into one.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: A point of information. I understand the chair to rule that I had lost my opportunity to close the debate?

THE CHAIRMAN: You have.

DEL. SIMONS: Then I have a right to ten minutes as a member on the floor?

DEL. A. M. LEWIS (Ill.): I want to make a motion on this question to this effect: I move that the report of this committee be sent back to the committee for further consideration and for a further and more complete report at the next convention.

DEL. SIMONS: Will you permit an amendment? That that committee be increased to either five or some other number. There are only three left.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: I will put that in the motion, and that the committee be increased to nine; that this subject be referred back to the committee for further consideration, to report at the next convention, and that the committee be increased to nine. (Seconded.)

DEL. MORGAN: Won't you add the words, "That the committee be wage workers?"

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: I will leave that to the judgment of the congress, as to who the committee shall be.

DEL. MORGAN: Then I move that they be wage-workers.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: I accept the motion. I merely want to say that I think the next convention will have a right to expect that a committee of nine will have a more complete report and will be in a position to take some definite position on this question at the next convention. It would probably be unfair to criticise the present committee for the lack of definiteness of view on this subject. I do not suppose there is a more difficult question confronting the Socialists of the country than the question of agriculture. We have probably about the most backward Socialist movement of the world. The Germans are the best informed and have the most skillful Socialist movement of the world, and yet the Germans have not solved this problem. I am informed, and I have reason to believe informed correctly, that the Germans, in spite of being able to carry the industrial cities and the metropolitan cities, have not yet been able to carry the agricultural districts. The agrarian problem is one of the most difficult before us. We have heard from experts on this question, from Oklahoma and from Nebraska, and the Nebraska delegate acknowledges that in his judgment we are not prepared, and even the delegate from Nebraska is not prepared to give us any definite position for which we should stand. I haven't any very great faith in the farmer as he stands to-day. Talk about his reading newspapers and the best books, that does not fit with my experience of the farmer. I tried to sell Socialist books a hundred times to audiences of the farmer, and it is a discouraging business. I am not going to try it any more; life is too short. The farmer does not buy books to any noticeable extent. The farmer does not have the Socialist psychology. He does not live in a capitalist environment. The American farmer to-day, it is true, is not so backward as the farmer of the old countries, because the farmer of the old countries has always been a farmer; his fathers and his grandfathers and his forefathers were farmers. But the farmers of this country have been drawn from the cities. Some of them have come out of the mines, and they have not a long ancestry of farmers behind them, and consequently they have something of the wage-workers' psychology, and the farmer problem will probably not be as difficult in this country as abroad. But it is too difficult for us at present. We

are not prepared, we have not formulated our views, and we do not know where we stand. We are uncertain, we are not direct, and until we know better what to do and how to do it, in my opinion this motion is the only proper motion, that this body lay it over and take a scientific attitude. If we do not know what to do to-day, we should wait until we do know. (Applause.)

DEL. BELL (Tex.): I am not a farmer, and I do not know that I have heard a farmer speak yet. Therefore, I am not going to pretend to be speaking as a farmer. The comrade who spoke for Oklahoma is a musician from Columbus, Ohio, I believe, and is not a practical farmer. But while I am also a musician, I have been for nearly five years in daily and hourly correspondence with farmers, and therefore I know the farmers' feelings on these questions, the feelings of the Texas farmers. Now, who is the farmer? I am very sure, from what I have heard here this morning, that those of us who are speaking of the farmer do not know what they are speaking of. They do not know which farmer they are speaking of. There is only one kind of farmer, and that is the man who farms the farm, and that is the man that is involved in this question. Those are the numerous ones in the farming country. Those are the bulk of the population, the ones that are farming the soil. Now, I want to tell you that the farmer that most of you have had in mind here is not in Texas; at least we do not call him a farmer in Texas; the farmer that most of you have in mind. I believe that Comrade Ameringer, in response to a question, "How much employing does the farmer do?" made the statement that they don't employ any labor, these farmers that he is speaking of. We haven't got that farmer exactly that he referred to in Oklahoma. Now, if you are going to have private ownership of your farms, you first have to give the farm to the farmer, because he hasn't got it. If you go to some of the farms in Texas you will find a public school and a county seat, with a creamery and over the establishment a First National Bank sign. We have in Texas 244 little Irelands. I want to state that I don't want to talk long on this. I don't intend to talk long, and I don't think we ought to talk on it at all. I don't think it ever ought to have come up, and I think I am reflecting the spirit of the comrades from Texas when I tell you that we want no farmers' programme. I will object to Comrade

Lewis's motion on the ground that that is a future consideration of the subject. I want it to take proper course in the congress; dismiss this thing here as quick as you can and get it out of the way, because the Texas farmer doesn't want anything but Socialism.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I am a member of this committee, and I have been for three or four years. I am opposed to this motion to refer. I think we ought to settle it here. But there is one fact; it seems to me we want to make a very strong protest against an apparent opinion of some comrades here that this report, as suggested, is foolish or unscientific. The comrade who spoke a moment ago said that this is nonsense and foolish and so on. Now, there is not a single proposition in that printed programme that is before you which has not been put forth by such men as August Bebel, William Liebknecht, Franz Vollmar and a dozen or fifteen others of the best and most real revolutionary Socialists in the world to-day. (Applause.)

Now, can we in America not stand up and look one problem fairly in the face, the way they do in other countries, and consider it? That is not foolish. It would be foolish to do anything else. Here is our proposition. A programme has been drawn up. I think the attitude of the committee in this matter is a very reasonable one. We say: Here is a great problem. We say that this situation has been studied very thoroughly by our comrades in other countries. I hold in my hand now, as I did two years ago, a pamphlet on this question prepared by the men whose names I mentioned a moment ago, the result of their most careful, thoroughgoing consideration. Now I say we ought to be able and willing to get right down to brass tacks on a proposition like this, and study it and find out about it; and as Comrade Lewis suggested—and I agree with it—so far as we know let us say; so far as we do not know let us say we do not know. Let us proceed to face it and keep ourselves in line until we do find out. Let us hear from Nebraska, Texas, Oklahoma, Maine, Massachusetts, Oregon, Mississippi and New Jersey.

Now, I want to call your attention to another thing. The farmers' programme is a part of the Socialist movement, of the Socialist philosophy and Socialist principle. A comrade a moment ago ridiculed as nonsense this whole thing. I wonder if he knows that forty members went to the Second Duma in Russia on

this very programme that we are proposing here. (Applause.) If he does not know that, then he ought to find out, and we ought to find out that the farmers' programme is a part of the International Socialist movement. It is one of the things that they are grappling with and wrestling with everywhere, and I propose that we grapple with it and wrestle with it. If the comrades are not satisfied with the wrestling and grappling that we have done now, all right, send it back to our committee and we will grapple with it and wrestle with it some more. But let us not forget that the future of our movement depends upon the farmers, and the day that we get the farmers into the Socialist movement it can carry the country. We must do it. The future of the party in America depends on it. Let us get busy on this problem and find out the truth, and if it takes from now until the next national convention, I am with you on that proposition. (Applause.)

DEL. CUMBIE (Okla.): I want to say that the reason I am on this rostrum now is because I was approached a while ago and asked by the comrades to make a short talk. And I want to say that I believe our comrade last upon the floor sounded the keynote of the future of the Socialist Party, in my judgment, when he made the statement that the future success, in the last analysis, of the Socialist movement in America depends on the interest of the agriculturists of this nation. I was sorry to find injected into the discussion this afternoon anything that looked like the belittling of the idea of some programme representing the agriculturists of our states. When I leave here, I hope to go back to Oklahoma and be able to tell the farmers of Oklahoma, the men who are struggling under the conditions of landlordism, that I have something to say encouraging to them. I am going to talk just a little about some of the practical results following the adoption of this nonsensical, frivolous, thoughtless proposition, as our Oklahoma programme has been announced. And by way of correction, I want to say that I think it comes with ill grace from comrades from states that have never attempted to give us any kind of a programme, to get up and ridicule ours. We have done the best we could. We have made a small beginning, and I want to say to you to-day, that is the result of the small beginning along the line of this farmers' programme. The farmers of Oklahoma are flocking to the standard of Socialism as never before. (Applause.)

In Stevens County, Oklahoma, recently it was my pleasure to do twenty days' work, and in a certain special agricultural district of that county I organized 108 members into the Socialist locals of that county, and out of the 108 there were 102 that were actual working farmers on farms. My comrade has told you that 90 per cent of our members in Oklahoma are agriculturists. In closing I want to repeat and reiterate the statement of the comrade last upon the floor, that the final analysis and the last analysis of the Socialist movement in our nation must hinge upon the agriculturist of our nation. His is the hand that feeds the world, and though you may be very anxious, as I myself would be desirous of success, it will not come from conflict upon the battlefield or on the field of bullets. I believe that our object, the final goal, of Socialism, will be reached along another line, "The dream of Debs," if you please, in regard to this movement. And when the final fight is made and we get the agriculturists enlisted in the movement, then it is an easy proposition to take care of the other fellows, because the farmer feeds them all. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I believe the Socialist Party pretends to represent the working class. If it does not, I want to get out of it. There is nothing in the Socialist platform that denies the right of a man to have enough ground to make a living out of. It says nowhere that, if a man works on a farm, he is necessarily a capitalistic exploiter; and if a man lives on a farm and works on that farm to get a living he does not necessarily thereby become a capitalist. He is a working man.

Now, it has been said by the delegates from Oklahoma that most of the men who are farmers in Oklahoma are the men who work the land. I don't object to a man owning land enough to make a living. I do object to one class exploiting another class by a wage system, whether he employs that exploited class to work on a machine or on the land. As I understand the Oklahoma proposition, it is that the people who are organized into the Socialist Party are men that have settled on the land and work it and do not depend upon a wage working class to make their living. Plenty of us here might be considered middle class, but that does not prevent us thinking straight and being class conscious. Our party is working against exploitation, and if the farmers of Oklahoma are not exploiting

anybody then they cannot be considered middle class capitalists. But the farmers as a class are being exploited by several parties, the landlord, the railroad, the middle men generally. Now the question is here: If we can go with the farm element and frame up a programme on which we can stand with the farmers and the farmers are willing to hew close to the line, and condemn exploitation, and go with the working class, all well and good, but if they cannot do that we don't want them.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I feel very much interested in this question for two reasons. In the first place Wisconsin is overwhelmingly agricultural. It is the first butter and cheese state in the union. New York used to have the honor of being the first cheese state, Illinois being the first butter state; but Wisconsin has passed them both. Your good Elgin butter is Wisconsin butter.

As early as 1898 I got a farmers' programme through the Socialist convention. But you should have seen the storm it raised. It was downed by a referendum. Ever since then I have felt the necessity of this party getting into touch with the farmers. And our party needs and must have a farmers' programme, even sooner than the Socialist Party of any other civilized country of the world. However, the greatest Socialist minds of Europe have spent years on this question without succeeding. Kautsky has written a book of about five hundred pages; and it is the poorest book he has written. He came to no final conclusion. France has adopted a platform by which they guarantee small farmers possession of their lands under Socialism. This is wrong, of course. In the first place, that guarantee would not be worth anything, because the grandchildren would not be ruled by any such guarantee. Secondly, it is not Socialistic.

The great trouble is that Marx himself falls down on the question of agriculture. We have to admit it.

I used to go round and preach twenty-five years ago, telling them we would have capitalistic farming on a large scale, farm trusts, so to speak. There was a man by the name of Dalrymple had a 50,000 acre farm up in Dakota, and another man named Schenle had a 20,000 acre farm in Pennsylvania and I told them the small farmer was gone, and that we would soon have tremendous bonanza farms that would employ thousands and thousands of men. We figured that concentration would take place the

same way in agriculture that it does in the factory. That is where we were wrong. The introduction of farm machinery has brought about an entirely different condition..

DEL. SEIDEL: Exactly so.

DEL. BERGER: The introduction of machinery works entirely differently in the field of agriculture than it does in the field of industry.

It is this way, comrades: In the industry it has practically eliminated the small employer, practically put him out of existence and created the trust. Now, it seems that the introduction of the machine works differently in the field of agriculture. All that it has done there is to eliminate the farm worker. The farmer with his machines and his three or four farm hands can now do the work. It has eliminated, for a time at least, you might say, the possibility of a steadily growing class of hired laborers. I don't know the reason for it. I tried to study it out for myself this way—I don't know whether Simons will agree with me or not. In the first place, in the factory industry, by the new inventions the technique, the process of production, has been changed. The entire technique has been changed. The entire process has been changed in the large factories of the trusts. But the introduction of machinery on the farm, in agriculture, did not have that kind of result. I think that is one of the reasons. The other reason—and I don't know whether Simons will agree with me there or not—is this, comrades, that the advantage of the big capitalists in the big industries is that they can use their capital and employ it the year round and day and night, while in the farm industry the machine can only be employed during a few months of the year.

Furthermore, the farmers can get together co-operatively on thrashing machines, for cheese factories and creameries. They run as many as sixty cheese factories co-operatively in one county of Wisconsin. I don't know whether my explanation holds good, but that is the way I tried to explain it to myself. At any rate, I don't preach any more that we are going to have big bonanza farms. The Dalrymple farm went to pieces; the Schenle farm was cut up; we don't really know what the result will be. Simons and I don't exactly agree, and Morgan and I surely don't agree. (Great laughter.)

I don't know what the result will be, whether it will be intensive farming or what kind of farming will be brought

about. Kropotkin, a great philosopher in his way, although an Anarchist, claims that intensive farming with the help of electricity will be the farming of the future and that three acres will be enough for each farm. Of course, that would bring about individualism. If that is to be the case we may have individualism some day in place of Socialism. However, one thing is sure, there is no use in attempting to break eggs that have not been laid yet. We cannot have Socialism in this country, if we don't get the farmers in some way. If you try to take away the farms of twelve millions of farmers of this country you will have a big job on your hands. You might as well try to reach down the moon. Even Tommy Morgan could not do it.

DEL. MORGAN: Put me on that committee and I'll fix it.

DEL. BERGER: If you were put on that job you would not last long. You remember how much effort and how many men it cost England to conquer thirty thousand farmers, Boers—Boers, mind you—and now try to take the farms from these twelve million American farmers and you will have about a million times harder job. Besides, they don't need to fight. All they have to do is to stop bringing food to Chicago for six weeks and Comrade Morgan and the rest of Chicago would be knocked out.

DEL. MORGAN: That is the only way you can knock me out.

DEL. BERGER: We must have some kind of a farmers' programme. It has been said that the proposition of the committee guarantees the farmer's possession of his land. I have looked this over carefully and Morgan is mistaken. It does not. But we must have some sort of programme and I am willing this shall be postponed until the question is understood; that we appoint a committee, and refer the farmers' question to that committee. I would like to be on that committee if I could. This interests me intensely. Let us study the question, as long as we are not ready to decide. I am in favor of referring this to a committee.

DEL. SIMONS (III.): I am in favor of referring this back to the committee, enlarging the committee, and giving them time to study it. This is a proposition that above everything else needs study and education. There was a time when I didn't know anything about the question at all. I thought I knew all about it. I knew absolutely and positively and certainly that unless we got that little

farmer's farm away from him we never could have Socialism. We had to take it or the great big capitalist would swallow it, and in a few years there would be just a few big farms in this country. We would grab them all and then we would have the co-operative commonwealth. But after a while I began to study the question a little more deeply. I studied a long while on it. I think I can say truthfully that I read pretty nearly everything that was printed in French, German or English on this question, and at the end of that time I produced "The American Farmer." In Europe at least two editions of twenty-five thousand copies of that work were issued. It was translated into nearly every European language. Yet in that book, as I studied more and more, I got less and less certain, and in it I made a good many more positive statements than I would be willing to make to-day. This programme has been called ridiculous. I can admit it, for it is not mine. It is practically the same in most respects as that adopted at the late French congress and adopted and advocated by such famous Socialists as Jules Guesde, the foremost Marxian in the European movement to-day. It was a good enough programme for Paul La Fargue, the son-in-law of Karl Marx. But in that programme they guaranteed the peasant ownership of his farm. I will not stand for that. Instead of guaranteeing that, we say something entirely different. I am astonished that a shrewd keen lawyer accustomed to reading things carefully, should say that we had guaranteed or proposed to guarantee the private ownership of land.

DEL. MORGAN: That is only what you say now. It is what you say there. I don't care for what you say now.

DEL. SIMONS: That is not what we asked you to consider.

DEL. MORGAN: I am looking for facts.

DEL. SIMONS: You will get facts. The German Socialists began to take up this thing. In the first place they were just as cocksure, and just as ignorant, on the subject as many of those who have spoken here to-day. Then Kautsky began to study this thing; a whole lot of German Socialists began to study this thing; they began to find out that they did not know all about it; they began to find out that a door was opened here that was wider than they ever dreamed of. They began to find out that here was a problem more complex, more intricate, than the industrial problem—more difficult

of analysis. But all of them—Bebel, Liebknecht, Kautsky—and surely they are men who know nearly as much about Marxian philosophy as Delegates Lewis and Morgan—almost as much, but not, of course, quite as much—but every one of them practically stands on these same principles. I can get you the quotations from Comrade Kautsky, if you wish. But no great Socialist to-day seriously proposes to take the small farmer's farm away from him. He does not propose to do so because it cannot be done. It does not make any difference what you say; what resolutions you pass; it can't be done. Look into this thing. Don't say to the farmer: "We will fix it up later." Shakespeare says somewhere: "I can call spirits from the vasty deep" and the reply is: "So, marry, can I; but will they come?"

We may pass farmers' programmes; we may say that we will drive him off his farm; but up to this time we have not got him really interested. We have done nothing but shout and make a loud noise, in our conventions, and that he does not even hear. It is time we studied this thing. It is time we knew something about it. It is time that in our state and national conventions we did something besides shout empty phrases. It is time we got some real knowledge on this subject. It is not enough to read a few pamphlets published in this country by men who try to translate Marx and don't know anything about it. We want a knowledge of Socialism that is a little bit deeper, a little more consistent with the actual facts.

Comrade Lewis, of Oregon, said that we were toadying to this and toadying to that. There is just one thing on earth that I will toady to and that is a fact. And when I meet a fact so big as the farmer question in America, a fact that has in it the future of twelve millions of people of the producing classes, without whom we stand no more chance of a Socialist victory in this country than we do of changing the orbit of the comet, when I face a fact as big as that, I don't try to stand in front of it and howl empty phrases, in the hope that that fact will get out of the way.

So I ask you to send this back. Fire me from the committee if you wish. I will keep studying anyhow. I will keep on working, because between me and the liberty I seek, between me and the co-operative commonwealth, between the working men of America and their dominion over this country, there stands

the farmers' question, and until we solve that question we might almost as well give up trying to get the thing we want.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): We discussed the immigration problem and some of the comrades gave us soap box speeches as a solution. We studied the woman problem and some of the comrades gave us soap box speeches on that question. They told us this was a class struggle; that we were working for the working class; that we were fighting for the working class; as though these delegates selected to represent the Socialists of the country have to be told the A, B, C of Socialism. Now we are discussing the farmers' question and some of the comrades are giving us soap box speeches again.

Now, I want it understood that I am in full accord with Comrade Simons on this question. I want it understood also, that on the great fundamentals of this question, Comrade Kautsky is also in accord with us.

Karl Marx, in his third volume on "Capital," assumed that centralization in the farming industry would take exactly the same course that it had taken and was taking in other industries; but he merely assumed that; he never investigated that. He never investigated the tendencies of agriculture in England, or in Germany, and much less in America, and when the question finally came up for discussion in Germany after long years of an impossibilist attitude on the part of the most advanced Marxians, Kautsky found that the Socialist position was this: The Socialist party demanded only the expropriation of the appropriators of the tools of production and distribution which were used to exploit the producers. But he found there was never anywhere in the Socialist movement any demand for the expropriation of the users of the tools, who use the tools to live. So far back as the Communist Manifesto you find that position. Kautsky now says that there is no proof that the great proprietors are gobbling up the small farms, or that the small farm is in every way industrially inferior to the great capitalist farm.

He says that the reason that the small farm is maintaining its own against the great farm is not so much because it is economically superior, but because the small farmer by exploiting his wife and his son and daughter can compete with the great capitalist, who has to pay regular wages to his farm laborers.

So long as it is admitted that the small farm will have the advantage perhaps for

a hundred years to come, the only sensible position that the Socialist Party can take is the position taken by Comrade Simons in this report.

DEL. O'HARE (Kans.): As a woman born and reared on a farm, and working during most of the years that I have spent in the Socialist movement as an agitator among the farm workers, I wish to make one simple statement on this question, and that is to reiterate the statement of Comrades Simons and Thompson that this is a fact that simply must be met. Now, I don't mind dodging an issue as long as it can be dodged gracefully, but the time has come in this movement when this farmers' question can no longer be dodged. Either the Socialist agitator has got to leave the farm regions of the west and southwest alone, or that Socialist agitator has got to go to those intelligent farmers with some programme that they can understand. And I say to you that the men and women to whom I speak out there will average in intelligence fully as high as any audience ever gathered in the Garrick Theater in Chicago. I tell you, comrades, when you stand face to face with a great audience of seven thousand farmers, as I stood last fall at St. John, Kansas, and when they said: "Mrs. O'Hare, the Republican senator has talked to us on the land question; tell us the position of the Socialist Party," then there was no dodging for me. I had either to state the position of the Socialist Party on that matter or sneak out; but I didn't have anything to offer to those seven thousand farmers. I must work among the farmers because it is the farmer's psychology that I know. I don't try to go before any other group of people because I would be a fool if I did. I know my limitations. I can talk to people who were born on the Western ranches as I was, I can talk to those who have lived the life of a farmer's daughter, and a farmer's wife, and as I say, I want to work among them; and so I say, when I go back among them, give me something to talk on, something that I can take a stand on.

Next Sunday I have to stand before an audience in Kansas City, Kansas, and report to them on this congress. On the 26th, 27th, and 28th, I have to stand before meetings of farmers in Kansas. Now, I am perfectly willing to admit that there are a number of comrades here who do not know enough of this question to take a stand on this matter, but I say to you, if we have not yet taken any position on this farm question, for God's

sake let us find one. When I go to the wage workers, I don't go with a farmers' programme; but I must have one for the farmers. We do not say that this statement here is the last statement that we Socialists shall make on this question; but I do say that it is the best thing that we have yet had; and you fellows that know so much, if you will only get up and give us a better one, we shall all be under great obligations to you. You are just the chap I am looking for. If you haven't got anything better, vote for this. Must I go back to the farmers and say that we don't know and I don't know what we are talking about? I want something authoritative back of me.

So I say, keep the committee, increase it if you wish, go on studying, but, comrades, I don't want to wait two years to have the Socialists take some kind of a position. If we have not a position on this matter, let us find one. Let us find one quick.

DEL. AMERINGER: Comrade O'Hare, you have traveled all over the west and southwest, and I wish you would tell this congress something in regard to the farm labor question.

DEL. O'HARE: From my experience in those sections the farm labor question as a wage problem does not exist. The thing that was mentioned by Comrade Untermann is absolutely the condition in that country. The farmer exploits his wife and his son and daughter. I have seen a woman five hours before her child was born dragging a ten foot cotton sack—and I have seen that woman back there with her ten day old babe, and that is the kind of a farm labor problem we have in the southwest.

DEL. CANNON (Ore.): I want to introduce a few ideas that I think have not yet been presented. I am in favor of having no farm programme. You have the sense of this congress that we ought to have a farmers' programme, and I think we should therefore continue this committee. If that committee is continued and enlarged I want to say this: don't leave off of that committee the laboring man; the man who is tied down to one industry all his life is not necessarily the best judge of the condition in that industry. You have heard from the farmers; are they the ones best fitted necessarily to judge of this question? We should take their view; but we should also take the view of others; we should take a broad view of the question. All classes should be represented on that committee. We are talking of having a farmers' pro-

gramme; why not have a programme for the railroad employee?

DEL. BERGER: We have it.

DEL. CANNON: Why not make a special programme for every line of labor?

DEL. BERGER: We are trying to do that if we can work it out.

DEL. CANNON: Does not the farmer use machinery on the farm? My objection to the farmers' programme here is, that it favors individual ownership of a public utility. I am opposed to anything that will stand for the private ownership of any public utility. Land is a public utility. They have cited great authorities here. Which is best: to cite precedents and authorities, or to use reason as your guide?

A DELEGATE: Whose reason?

DEL. SEIDEL: May I ask what is your vocation?

DEL. CANNON: I was raised on a farm and lived on a farm for twenty-five years.

DEL. SEIDEL: What is your occupation at the present time?

DEL. CANNON: I lived on a farm for twenty-five years. Part of the time as an employer; part of the time as a wage worker.

DEL. SEIDEL: What are you doing now?

DEL. CANNON: Most of my time I have spent on a farm; now I am a lawyer.

DEL. SEIDEL: Are you a member of a farmers' association?

DEL. MERRICK: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Seidel will remain silent. Comrade Cannon has the floor.

DEL. SEIDEL: He dodged the question.

DEL. CANNON: I can answer his question, but I cannot answer a continuous fire of questions.

COM. HUNTER (Conn.): Comrades and Friends: We are here in this congress supposed to represent certain class interests of this country. We have sat here for four days; we have heard from the most learned men that we supposed we could pick out from our party on certain questions, and we have decided those questions, every one of them, in my opinion, unsatisfactorily. We have wasted a lot of time; we have mouthed a lot of phrases; but we have not gotten down to the facts. We have not considered the essentials of any question that we have yet met. We have not even discussed these questions as intelligent thinkers;

we have been passionate and emotional in all that we have said and done. I have stood here and watched this congress for several days and I am disappointed. Now, I am here to express my individual opinion. I want to say this: On all of these matters you have appointed men to study these questions, who are supposed to know something about them; you have appointed Ernest Untermann, known all over the world, a man whose name is familiar to Socialists everywhere, a man who has given his life to the study of these problems; you have appointed A. M. Simons, a man who has studied this farmers question from top to bottom, who has given every possible care and attention to it and who has written a book that is valued and appreciated in Europe, and that is not read by the members of the Socialist Party of America. You have appointed other men who have given deep and serious consideration to these problems. And then a man comes along who has read a few pamphlets and has learned a few phrases about economic determinism, and the class conflict, and he thinks he can settle all the problems of the earth with a few glittering phrases.

Now, this question has been discussed by every Socialist convention in the world; some of the greatest thinkers in our movement have written programmes on this subject; how many of you have read those programmes? How many of you have read the three programmes of the German party on this question? How many have seen the Belgian programme on that question? How many have seen those of France and Italy? How many of the comrades here are prepared to discuss this farmers' question? And yet we must have the co-operation of the farmers, if we are to accomplish anything for the working classes; if we are ever to bring about the triumph of Socialism. We have got to have with us the thousands of men who are just as miserable on their farms as the poor exploited sweater of the East side. We have got to stand together. You see him in this struggle; you see him fighting the landlord; you see him fighting the man with the mortgage; you see him fighting the usurer; and you say you believe in the materialistic conception of history. Is that your answer to his cry? You say you believe in the materialistic conception of history. He says: What is that? That is economic determinism. What is that? he asks. And that is how far we have got. Now, great heavens, men and women of this congress, there is a chance

in this country to do something; to do something for the exploited and miserable of our land, on the farms as well as in the factories. If you want to vote down this report, vote it down. Recommit it. I don't care. But I do say that you are under an obligation to the proletariat of this country to do something. You have got to give thought and consideration to this question, and do everything that lies in you to solve this problem for those who are in poverty and misery and distress and are fighting to the death against the landlord and the capitalist.

DEL. BREWER (Kans.): Comrade Hunter admits that after we have selected some of the brainiest men in the Socialist movement to study this question they admit that they don't know much about it; and so in preference to settling the thing they have been studying they take a document from the State of Oklahoma and ask us to endorse it. I am in favor of recommitting this subject to the committee and let them investigate it further.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I have two suggestions to make to the comrade here. Please go out and find what the world of Socialism has said on this farmers' question. There is one book that will tell you a lot about it and about the world of socialism, "Modern Socialism," an authoritative text book; and it is evident there are a lot of you who have not read it, by the way you talk. The other thought I have is this: We had a convention two years ago and I am not going to forget in a long time the discussion on this question, led by Stanley Clark. We took him and showed him one fact after another, from the party platforms, and he weakened little by little and finally he made a motion that Thompson and I were willing to accept, but those who had been with him previously said: No, no. And they voted us down. They laughed at us then and they said, "Look at your vote," and I laughed back and said: "Yes, but you watch that vote grow." And it grew and grew and finally resulted in a referendum that stated our position exactly.

I want you to do two things: Study the literature of International Socialism; and then read what the members of the party said in their referendum. Here is what was adopted by the referendum: "There can be no absolute private title in land." That is true to-day. But we have to tell some folks about it. "All titles, whether called fee simple or otherwise, must be subordinate to the public title." That is true now; but we have to

tell some people. But they object to the use of land in any form for the purposes of speculation or exploitation. That is what the comrades said, the comrades who pay their dues to the party. That is what they agreed to. And they demand the possession, control and management of the land to whatever extent may be necessary to attain that end. What end? To prevent exploitation and speculation, and so forth. It is not opposed to occupation; it is not opposed to possession. Get that? That is fundamental to this whole discussion. They are not opposed to the occupation or possession of the land by those using it in a useful and bona fide manner without exploitation.

Now, that goes to the root of this whole matter. If you agree with that, you stand with the rank and file of the party membership, at least the majority of that rank and file in the United States, as evidenced by the referendum. If you don't agree with it you better go home and get your instructions.

DEL. ATWOOD (S. D.): I am a farmer, a hayseed. I will give you some facts. I lived on a claim in South Dakota. I sold it and blew the money in. I was worse off owning the farm than I was without it, teaching school in the summer.

The Dakota farmer takes this position: He wants the full product of his labor. He believes that he did not make the land; that it was there when he came. It will be there when he is gone. By his work he is making from thirty to fifty cents a day, and he wants the full product of his labor. He does not care what you do with the ownership of the land; it is the full product of his labor that he is

after. This whole discussion or most of it would be described by some of our farmers as a lot of hog wash. If you adopt that programme we will have to explain it to the farmers. I guess I will have to vote for it, but it is not very much. We studied two philosophers out on the plains; one is Peter Finley Dunne and the other is Karl Marx. Peter Finley Dunne says: "Workers of the world, unite; yez have nothin' to lose but yer brains; and yez never had any." When we hear Tom Lewis, of Oregon, we think of that. (Laughter.) We also read Karl Marx and we believe in Karl Marx; we believe that the farms are being concentrated in the hands of the landlords, and that those farms are being let out to the men who work them. The landlord is the enemy of the worker on the farms. And the farmers and the farm laborers don't care what you do so long as you secure to him the full product of his labor. Do you get that?

The previous question being moved and seconded, was declared carried.

Delegate Lewis moved that the matter be referred back to the committee, the committee to be enlarged to nine members and to report at the next national convention of the party.

The motion was carried.

The following nominations were then made for the six new members of the Committee on Farmers' Programme:

Delegates Wright, Maurer, Laukki, Ameringer, O'Hare, De Bell, Atwood, Untermann, Hunter, Carpenter, Adel, Freeman, Crider.

Adjourned until May 20, 1910 at 9:30
A. M.

SIXTH DAY'S SESSION.

Secretary Roewer called the congress to order at 9:30 A. M.

Del. Goebel, of New Jersey, was elected Chairman for the day.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first order of business, as I understand, is the election of the committee on the farmers' question.

Del. Strebler: Before we go to that, I move to take up the matter of the adoption of the minutes of last Wednesday.

Certain corrections in the minutes were noted, and the minutes were then adopted.

FARMERS' COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the election of the Committee on Agricultural Programme, six to be elected, as I understand.

On motion of Del. Killingbeck, it was decided to elect by ballot.

The name of Del. Davis, of Oklahoma, was added to the list of nominees.

The following delegates accepted: Wright (Nebr.), Maurer (Pa.), Leo Laukki (Minn.), Ameringer (Okla.), O'Hare (Kas.), Atwood (S. D.), Hunter (Conn.), Carpenter (Calif.), Freeman (Ala.), Cryder (Tex.).

The following nominees declined: Berger (in favor of Thompson), Untermann, Adel, Davis.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will now proceed to a vote. You are to elect six new members on this committee in addition to those already on. There are six new ones, are there not?

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): The minutes show that Lewis, of Illinois, made the following motion: That the report of this committee be sent back to the committee for further consideration and for a further and more complete report at the next convention, and that the committee be increased to nine.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, that settles it. You vote for six. The tellers will now get ready to collect the ballots.

NEW CASTLE SITUATION.

DEL. KENNEDY (Pa.): I ask for five minutes to read a telegram that I have

prepared and that I want this Congress to stand for. There was a strong resolution introduced by the Resolution Committee in regard to the persecution of the Free Press in New Castle. That resolution will be buried in the proceedings of the convention, and I want a resolution adopted before the Free Press goes to press to-day. I want this Congress to stand for this telegram. There is nothing in it that you cannot stand for: "The National Congress of the Socialist Party pledges you the moral and financial support of the party in the persecution now being waged against the Free Press." Comrades, the Socialist press of the United States is not alive to what is going on in New Castle. You have heard about revolutionary action instead of phrases. In New Castle, there is revolutionary action. Six comrades are in jail for 90 days. Six more are under the same charge and are out on bond. Five more have been charged with criminal and seditious libel and will be brought to trial in June, and if convicted will be sentenced to the penitentiary for six years. One more is charged with criminal conspiracy and blackmail, and if convicted will be sent to jail for six years. I propose sending this telegram for the moral effect it will have in New Castle, so that the enemies of the Free Press will take warning that the Socialist Party of the United States is backing the New Castle comrades. A resolution like this should have been endorsed long ago, only for the fact that the persecuted comrades are obscure working men who are not known outside of Lawrence county, Pa. When this telegram goes forward it will, in a couple hours, be put up in their window. The paper goes to press to-day. This is the first case of criminal and seditious libel in the United States for 107 years, and I hope the Socialist Party will take some action to-day that will make it the last case for another 107 years. Not only every Socialist, but every lover of liberty and every defender of free speech and free press can stand for this.

Del. Hoogerhyde, of Michigan, moved

that the telegram be sent. (Motion seconded.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): You understand, I have a libel suit on, myself, at this moment, so I am not going to object. I want one thing understood by this party congress, and that is that everything is as stated. I take your word for it absolutely, and if it is not as stated you will never hear the last of it. There is one thing we must do in our party. We must be absolutely straight and above suspicion or the shadow of suspicion. I am not speaking of the Free Press, understand. I have a libel suit at this moment for \$50,000, and I stand with the New Castle comrades, only I hope everything is absolutely straight. There are some ugly charges made there against some of our comrades—hold-up charges. I hope that there is absolutely nothing to it, because, just imagine if there be the least thing crooked there, and this congress going on record for it, where would we be? Comrade Kennedy, I take your word for it, absolutely, that everything is absolutely straight.

DEL. KENNEDY: All the comrades from Pennsylvania will stand by it. Comrade McKeever has been accused of blackmail. When the steel workers went on strike Comrade McKeever went to the engineers, and although the strike had nothing to do with the engineers, he organized a sympathetic strike, and when the foreman discharged them, McKeever pulled the whistle and closed down the works, and they had to send detectives to Connecticut to get engineers to carry on the work.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

The tellers then retired to count the vote on the election of the farmers' committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the report of the Committee on Constitution, Comrade Gaylord, chairman, Comrade Bloor, secretary.

DEL. GAYLORD, reporting for the Committee on Constitution: Comrade Chairman and Comrades, to save time and to insure a more complete understanding, the committee has had prepared in parallel columns the constitution as it now stands, which is in the left-hand column, and the proposed amendments in the right-hand column. If you will look at the left-hand column you will see that

occasionally words, phrases, paragraphs or sections are printed in black-faced type. These are those which the majority of the committee recommend, and generally unanimously recommend, to be stricken out.

The first change submitted by the committee was Section 3 of Article II, as follows:

"Sec. 3. A member who desires to transfer his membership from the party in one state to the party in another state may do so upon the presentation of his card showing him to be in good standing at the time of asking for such transfer. The secretary of the local to which he transfers shall notify the secretary of the local from which he transfers."

DEL. GAYLORD: Now, Comrades, I think it in order, if there be no objection, to pass each point without discussion, or even a motion.

DEL. WHITE (Mass.): I move to adopt the recommendation of the committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): I notice it says a member in good standing may be transferred. Suppose I were visiting for two, four or six months, and in the meantime I have paid no dues, and then go into a new club, before I am transferred, shall I pay my back dues to the club if this is adopted?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the Chair first state the method of procedure as to adoption, unless there is objection to it. We will have each item read, and if there is no objection I will then declare that article adopted as read, without any formal motion, just to save a motion. The Chairman of the committee will answer Comrade Cannon's question.

DEL. GAYLORD: As I understand the question, it is this: If a man leaves his local and is absent three or four months and has not paid his dues and wishes to join another, then can he pay his back dues and receive a transfer card? Is that your question?

DEL. CANNON: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: The answer, it seems to me, is plain. If the old local is willing to accept his dues and give him a transfer card, nobody else can have anything to say about it.

DEL. CANNON: Then I understand that the dues would go to the former local instead of the one to which he was transferred?

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes. Otherwise you would not be in good standing to get a transfer card.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no ob-

jection the section will stand approved as read. I hear no objection, and it is so ordered.

The next section of the report was read, as follows:

"Amend Sec. 5, Art. II, by striking out the words 'propertied classes' in line 8, and substitute 'capitalist class.'"

It was moved and seconded that the section be adopted.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I am opposed to that change. It opens the door wide for an alliance of the Socialist Party with the municipal ownership party or any political organization of men of property. Ours has been distinctly a wage class, non-propertied movement. The fundamental purpose of the organization has been to abolish private property as a means of exploiting the masses of the people and to establish common property.

DEL. GAYLORD: Will you permit me just a word? I can save some time for you. You will be very glad of the time I save.

DEL. MORGAN: I have been told that many times, that if I will shut up somebody will say what I have to say better than I can and in a shorter time. I am able to take care of myself. The propertied class is distinguished by the ownership of property, but the members may be the same as the working class, the wage class. Who is going to distinguish the capitalist class in a capitalist political organization? Who is going to define it? The lines are clearly drawn. There has been a distinct purpose upon the part of the master class and the educated class to bury the real meaning of the words that the working class understand. I have called your attention before in this congress to that fact, but I want to present that here again, that there has been three positive civilized systems establishing the relationship between human beings. The first was slavery; you understand what that is?

DEL. KILLINGBECK: We don't want a lecture.

DEL. MORGAN: The next was serfdom; you understand what that is? The present relationship is that of master and servant. That is a legal term; that is a positive term; that is what the workers understand. When you tell the worker he is a wage slave he understands it. You tell him he is a servant, and he understands it. You tell him his interests are opposed to the propertied class, and he understands it. But when you call him exploited, that is something different. It

does not carry distinction with it. It is confused in his understanding. Now, we have put in there the "propertied classes," the haves, as against the have-nots, the people who have nothing to lose but their chains, and you are getting rid of all the fundamental expressions. You call them sentimental phrases and all that, and you introduce these phrases from the political economists of the capitalist class. How are you going to distinguish? I own some property.

A DELEGATE: Aha!

DEL. MORGAN: Yes, you can understand that. You can understand that, and if I join with the municipal ownership party, mind you, you can understand that that party is opposed to the wage workers, to this party. But if you cut out that word and put in "capitalist," am I a capitalist? Who is going to say? I have got a home, and you will have to hunt up my record and inquire into my business before you know. My wife has got some property, and according to the law I understand the wife and husband are one; there is where I come in. But don't forget, there is a tendency here to ridicule me. There is a tendency to treat me with some degree of contempt. There is a laugh that goes around when I refer to my membership. I want to press into your minds that I have been a wage worker 38 years, and if I have managed to get something for my old age it is to my credit that I can stand on both my feet now and not care a damn for any capitalist, but am a propertied person that stands with the worker. I am in his party and I am going to fight for it as long as I have breath, and I am going to oppose every effort that is made by our intellectuals and politicians in the party to eliminate the meaning of words in our platform, and I oppose this.

Question was put on the adoption of the amendment and it was declared carried. A division was called for.

DEL. MORGAN: I ask for a roll call on that vote.

The roll call was opposed as being out of order.

The Chairman held that any member had a right to demand a roll call.

Del. Simons appealed from the decision of the Chair, on the ground that the roll call was not demanded by a sufficient number of delegates. Other delegates having called for a roll call, Del. Simons withdrew his objection, and a roll call was then ordered.

DEL. BREWER (Kans.): We are unable to vote intelligently. I cannot see

why they should desire to change that from "propertied classes?"

THE CHAIRMAN: This is not the time for debate. We will now vote. If you favor putting the word "capitalist" in place of the word "propertied," you will vote Yes. If you do not favor putting "capitalist" in place of "propertied," you will vote No as your names are called.

The roll was then called, the vote resulting in 58 in favor, 30 against, 20 absent or not voting.

Alabama—Yes: C. G. Hutchisson.

Arizona—No: Jos. D. Cannon.

Arkansas—Absent: Stanley J. C. Clark.

California—Yes: W. Carpenter, J. Stitt

Wilson, Ernest Untermann, John H. Wilde. Absent: J. B. Osborne.

Colorado—Yes: W. P. Collins, Mila T. Mard.

Connecticut—Yes: Ella Reeve Bloor, Jasper McLevy.

Florida—Yes: C. C. Allen.

Idaho—No: T. J. Coonrod.

Illinois—No: May Wood-Simons, T. J. Morgan, A. W. Nelson. Yes: G. A. Peterson, A. M. Simons. Absent: G. T. Fraenckel, Robert Giese. Absent or not voting: A. M. Lewis.

Indiana—No: Oneal, S. M. Reynolds.

Iowa—Yes: John M. Work, J. J. Jacobsen.

Kansas—Yes: Caroline A. Lowe. No: Geo. D. Brewer, Kate Richards O'Hare.

Kentucky—Yes: Walter Lanfersiek.

Louisiana—Yes: J. W. Barnes.

Maine—Absent: Grace V. Silver.

Maryland—Absent: W. M. Coleman.

Massachusetts—Yes: James A. De Bell, James F. Carey, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr., Dan. A. White. No: Harriet D'Orsay. Absent: Marion Craig Wentworth.

Michigan—No: Frank Aaltonen, J. Hoogerhyde. Absent: Henry Kummerfeld.

Minnesota—Yes: Morris Kaplan, Leo Laukki, Mrs. Esther Laukki, J. E. Nash.

Missouri—No: W. W. McAllister. Absent: E. T. Behrens, W. L. Garver.

Montana—No: Geo. W. McDermott.

Nebraska—Yes: Clyde J. Wright.

Nevada—Yes: W. H. Burton.

New Hampshire—No: John P. Burke.

New Jersey—Yes: Max Fackert, Geo. H. Goebel, Frank Hubschmitt, W. B. Killingbeck.

New Mexico—Yes: C. B. Lane.

New York—Yes: Jos. Wanhopa, Algeron Lee, W. W. Passage, C. L. Furman, Dills, Gustav Strelbel. No: Frank Cassidy. Absent: Morris Hillquit.

North Dakota—Absent: Arthur Bassett.

Ohio—Yes: E. E. Adel, Miller, D. P.

Farrell. No: L. A. Zitt. Absent or not voting: Marguerite Prevey, John G. Willert.

Oklahoma—Yes: Oscar Ameringer, Winnie E. Branstetter. No: J. T. Cumbie, G. W. Davis.

Oregon—Yes: E. L. Cannon. No: Tom. J. Lewis.

Pennsylvania—Yes: Jos. E. Cohen, Thos. F. Kennedy, Robert B. Ringler. No: Fred H. Merrick, Edward Moore, Jas. H. Maurer, Adams.

Rhode Island—Yes: Fred Hurst.

South Dakota—Yes: E. Francis Atwood.

Tennessee—Yes: T. H. Haines.

Texas—Yes: Dan C. Crider. No: W. J. Bell. Absent or not voting: P. G. Zimmerman.

Utah—Absent or not voting: W. Thurston Brown.

Washington—No: Mrs. E. D. Cory, W. H. Waynick.

West Virginia—Absent or not voting: Harold W. Houston.

Wisconsin—Yes: Victor L. Berger, W. R. Gaylord, Emil Seidel, Carl D. Thompson.

Wyoming—No: W. L. O'Neil. Absent or not voting: John Heckala.

Delaware—No: J. Frank Smith.

Georgia—Yes: Paul Hochscheid.

Mississippi—Absent or not voting: S. W. Rose.

North Carolina—No: Rufus J. Morton.

South Carolina—Yes: A. J. Royal.

Virginia—Yes: E. B. Statton.

Summary: Yes, 58; nays, 30; absent or not voting, 20.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is adopted. We will now proceed to the next section.

DEL. GAYLORD: A new section is proposed to be added to Art. II, to be numbered Sec. 7. Sec. 7, as printed in the right column, is the report of the majority of the committee. In this case, however, the chairman is of the minority on that point, and I will ask Comrade DeBell to report for the majority.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.) read the proposed new section, as follows:

"Sec. 7. No member of the party shall be suspended or expelled without charges and opportunity to be heard, and every member expelled by a local of the party shall have the right to appeal from the decision of expulsion to the membership of the state, and as the final resort, to the National Executive Committee."

DEL. DE BELL: The feeling of the Committee was, after this amendment was offered, that there should be some

provisions made, so that the national organization would know who was and who was not suspended. I believe there have been some suspensions in states that were not justified, and they wanted to bring it up a little higher, so they took it up to the Executive Committee to make it final if they wished to go that far.

DEL. KILLINGBECK: I move to adopt that section. (Seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: I wish to present the report of the minority, which I think is in order. Comrades, the minority of the committee realize that there should be no unfairness in expulsion of members of the party. We realize that there might be possibly such unfairness within state organizations. But we do not wish to make seven elderly or young people the judges of the membership lists of the various states, who happen to be on the National Executive Committee. Accordingly, we present this section:

"No member of the party shall be suspended or expelled without written charges and an opportunity to be heard before his local or branch."

The meaning of that will be this: If John Jones is a member of the party in Illinois and is expelled without written charges, his case can be appealed to the national membership, not to the National Executive Committee. There is no provision for the appeal, but to have such facts brought to the attention of the national organization. There is no provision made for that. There are reasons for not making any provision. If the sense of justice in the party membership of the various locals of the state is not sufficient to demand a referendum on the question or an investigation, the case won't amount to much. So the question of the party membership within a state is still left to the local membership of that state unless the membership at-large is persuaded through the usual channels of publicity that the case is sufficiently serious to warrant interference with that which is one of the fundamental principles of our national organization, namely, the control by the state organizations of their own organization.

DEL. SIMONS: I am not in accord with either the minority or the majority, and I would move you to add these words right at the end of the section: "and as a final resort, to the National Executive Committee, provided such appeal is supported by locals or members at large including at least 25 per cent of the membership of the state from which the appeal comes."

Several delegates here have suggested to me that I put my percentage too high. Perhaps that is true. I won't squabble over that. I am going to put that at 10 instead of 25 per cent.

A DELEGATE: Five?

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): No, 5 per cent is too small. I would rather make it 20 per cent. I think the minority report does not mean anything. There is nothing to keep any person that feels aggrieved, if he can arouse sentiment enough to get a referendum, from doing so. There never has been anything to prevent it. But I object to the proposal that any individual member throughout the country can appeal directly to the National Executive Committee, which would mean that your National Executive Committee would sit 365 days a year, 24 hours a day, and do nothing else but pass on appeals of members. They might be bona fide and might not be bona fide; it would be an utterly unfair body to pass upon them, because the person making the appeal would not be able to bring witnesses there. They could not get at the facts, and it would be absolutely impossible to get an appeal unless you developed an entire system of jurisprudence like you have in the Supreme Court, providing that briefs must be submitted and the National Committee must be judges only of the law and not of fact. Such a system is utterly improper and utterly unworkable in practice in such an organization as we have. There should be no appeal of any individual unless he can get at least 10 per cent of the membership of the state to back him up. If he cannot get 10 per cent, then he is certainly not entitled to the work of 40,000 members. Ten per cent of 3,000 members in a state would be 300, and 10 per cent of 4,000 would be 400. If he cannot get 400 members in his state he is certainly not entitled to demand that the time of 40,000 members be taken up with the appeal. I want to tell you what this would mean, even with the provision as to the National Executive Committee left there. In the last year the Committee has passed on appeals from Texas, Missouri, Montana, Oregon, California, and I do not know how many more states. My own opinion is, that we have made the situation very much worse in Montana, and in the other cases it would have been much better if we had had no appeal.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I would like to ask a question of information as to the meaning of the amendment. I will read it again to get it clear: "Provided such appeal is supported by locals or members

at large including at least 10 per cent of the membership of the state from which the appeal comes." It says if supported by locals having 10 per cent of the membership of the state, the locals supporting. If 60 per cent of the members are in the locals supporting the appeal and 40 per cent are against, you would have only 10 per cent of the 60 per cent of the members.

DEL. SIMONS: I see your correction, and I think I will strike out the word "locals," if there is no objection to it. I will ask that the word "local" be stricken out. Now let me read it as changed: "Providing such appeal is supported by at least 10 per cent of the membership of the state from which the appeal comes."

THE CHAIRMAN: Read the entire thing as you wish it to stand.

DEL. SIMONS: (Quoting) "No member of the party shall be suspended or expelled without charges and opportunity to be heard, and every member expelled by a local of the party shall have the right to appeal from the decision of expulsion to the membership of the state, and as a final resort, to the National Executive Committee, provided such appeal is supported by at least 10 per cent of the membership of the state from which the appeal comes."

A DELEGATE: What do you do about written charges?

DEL. SIMONS: I don't think I have anything to do with that.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): Is this proposed as a substitute for the majority?

DEL. SIMONS: I propose to offer this whole thing as a substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a substitute for both the minority and majority reports. That is the proposition before the house.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I would like to know in regard to the question of the per cent. It says 10 per cent of the membership of the state. Does that mean the membership, or only 10 per cent of the vote as voted?

DEL. SIMONS: The membership that has voted.

DEL. FURMAN: Suppose the majority of the members don't vote, then what is going to happen? You don't get the vote of the membership, for the membership don't vote.

DEL. SIMONS: I mean this. In order to have an appeal he must get the signatures of at least 10 per cent of the members according to the last reported membership as determined for other

voting purposes by the national office, by dues paying.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is only for the initiative.

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I am opposed to the adoption of the section even with the addition made by Del. Simons, because the local or branch to which the member belongs knows better than anybody whether that member ought to be expelled or not. The National Executive Committee necessarily cannot know anything in particular about it unless witnesses are brought to Chicago and appear before them. They cannot intelligently pass upon such a question. And in addition to that, the National Executive Committee ought not to have any such power whatsoever. It is not in accordance with our principles to give any such power to a body of seven men. I would not want that power if I were on the committee myself, and I do not think any other seven men in the Socialist Party ought to have the power as the final resort to pass upon the membership of the members of this party.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): I favor the majority report of the committee. I am not so much afraid of the power of the National Executive Committee as Comrade Work appears to be. We know that there are times when locals in different localities become aroused over certain questions that come up before them, and we also are aware of the fact that the majority is not always right, although for the time being we are willing to abide by the decision of that majority. Now, at a time of great stress or excitement, if one of our members takes a firm stand for what he thinks is right, but he is a hopeless minority in that local, they have the power and they may carry out what the majority thinks is right, but I believe that the member standing for what he thinks is right, whether he is right or not, should have the power of appeal to something else besides the local. What we want to do is to give the membership a feeling that, no matter what they advocate, when they think it is right, that in the end they are going to have justice, and have a final hearing from a body far removed from what may be the local prejudices of the case.

Charges have been brought against the National Executive Committee on almost every action they have taken, and I myself am far from being satisfied with much that the National Executive Committee has done. But, when it comes to a question of my membership in the Socialist Party, on a matter of principle and

right, if the locality from which I came decides that I am wrong and puts me out of the party, I want to appeal to that National Executive Committee and have that point settled. I want the right to go over the heads of the local membership to get my standing in the party. Comrade Simons comes with an amendment that provides for a request from 10 per cent of the membership of the state. I want you to look over the various referendums that you have adopted and see what per cent of the entire membership of the party voted. Some of these referendums have got as high as 10 per cent, and those have been referendums upon which the most intense interest was displayed. Those have been referendums which have been of vital importance to the party and its machinery, and when you stop to think that you have only got 20 per cent of the membership on any of those referendums, how is it possible for any obscure member in obscure localities to get 10 per cent of the membership in order that he might have an appeal? I have only taken this suggestion up in order to show the importance of building up the Socialist Party. What we want to do is to build a big, magnificent organization. I want to place no barrier in the way of the membership getting into the organization and staying in it. I want the membership to have full confidence in the integrity of the party, local, state and national, and when they have got an idea or principle that they want to fight for, I want them to feel that they can go out and fight for that idea or principle with absolute confidence, that ultimately they are going to have a fair and final hearing, and have justice accorded to them. Comrade Gaylord, for the minority report of the Committee, tells us that he does not favor giving the Executive Committee this power; he does not favor giving them this power in the constitution, but he says they can do it any way. If he is willing to let them do it any way, why not put it down in black and white in the constitution, so that they know how to do it and how to proceed? As far as I am locally concerned, this clause, I think, will interfere very little with our work, because as yet, as far as I know, we have expelled but one member from the organization, and we have not even spoken of expelling any more. But, whether it is good for Arizona or Maine or Massachusetts or Washington or Florida, I do not know. I want them to have an opportunity to meet cases as they arise and authority to deal with them,

and the only way you can do it, is by adopting the majority report of this committee.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I want to state the situation. All those who are in favor of having the National Executive Committee constitute a Supreme Court will vote in favor of the majority report here as amended. Those who are opposed to it will vote in favor of the minority report.

DEL. M'ALLISTER (Mo.): In every debate that we have had in this hall, I have sat and listened. I have seen exhibited a spirit amounting almost to personal abuse. Now, in Missouri, we find a great big howl; in Texas I hear of it; in Oklahoma I hear of it; against the action of the Executive Committee. Now, I want to tell you that my visit to Chicago has proven to me many things that I did not know of. Our Executive Committee, my friends, is wrongly accused in a great many instances, and I find in the majority of instances and I find in the majority of instances. As regards this article that we are talking about, I have but one objection to it, and that is that final resort. I cannot see how you ever got it in there. We Socialists stand first, last and all the time against the arbitrary decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States where it has decided all these questions against labor in its fights against the capitalist class. My friends, I raise a warning voice to you in this congress. Never allow any man or set of men in the Socialist organization to have the power to finally decide anything. It is fatal to the aims of the Socialist Party of this country to lodge such supreme power with any set of men. I believe we ought to vote that down. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): You all know that I have been a member of several Socialist parties before this came into existence, and the split always came and the troubles always came because we took up a certain matter nationally and there was a cleavage all the way from ocean to ocean, simply because somebody could not agree with somebody. There were factional matters; they were appealed to the Supreme Court; there was dissatisfaction with the decisions of the supreme court; we had democracy gone to seed, and the thing went to pieces. That is the reason why I insisted upon state autonomy when this party was formed. Now, I have not invented many things in my life for which I can ask a patent, but this is one of my patents, the principle of state autonomy. You remember that

it was fought bitterly, especially by the East, at the unity convention at Indianapolis, and I may say that though Comrade Simons and Comrade Morgan did not agree with me on the question of programme, Tommy not so much as Simons, but they did agree with me on the question of state autonomy. That is what has split the party in Washington, and split the party in California, Missouri and Nebraska. They fired certain locals, and when it came up to the National Executive Board, all we could do was to offer our good services. Comrades, I do not want to be on the National Executive Board if I have to act as a member of a supreme court. (Applause.) There is not enough of the czar in me. I do not want to be a czar, and least of all a supreme court czar. I have held them back every time they have tried to interfere. I surely did not like the impossibilists of Washington. I disliked them. I knew they were a bad bunch in every respect, and I knew that they were not straight and they did not act straight, and they proved their own crookedness to us. However, I stood in favor of deciding that we could not interfere at any time and every time I stood by the constitution. Now, I do not want you to go back on that principle of state autonomy. All you have to do and all that is necessary for the Executive Board to do, is to go into a state and make it possible for the membership of that state to decide for itself. That is all we want. That is all that is necessary in order to make the organization more effective, and I am sorry that my friend and good Comrade Gaylord did not find a way of doing that. We ought to find a way that the National Executive Board, upon complaint of a certain number of members, should have the power to go into that state and call a referendum of the party membership of that state to decide its own affairs.

DEL. THOMPSON: They have it.

DEL. BERGER: They have not at the present time. The per cent is too high. You should make it possible that a reasonable percentage of them should have the right.

DEL. THOMPSON: That is covered in the second paragraph of Section 9, Article XII.

DEL. BERGER: I know this article, but that is not sufficient, because under that very proposition a handful of members could keep out several hundred good Socialists, as was done in the State of Washington, where they kicked them out, and then, having kicked them out, those

in power would not let them have anything to say. A little bunch could keep out a while lot of good, honest members of the party. Now, we ought to change that. So I say again, do not adopt the majority report as proposed, because I for one do not want to act as a member of a supreme court.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have no printed rules at hand here. Is there any objection from the floor to the Chair limiting the speeches to five mintes?

DELEGATES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. From now on I will call time at the end of five minutes, unless there is objection.

DEL. ADEL (Ohio): A point of information. I want to call your attention to Section 4 of Article XII of the Constitution, which says: "In states and territories in which there is one central organization affiliated with the party, the state or territorial organization shall have the sole jurisdiction of the members residing within their respective territories." To get over that you must have the consent of the respective state or territorial organizations. Ten per cent is not the consent of the organizations that you are asking for.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see that that is a question of information?

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): The report of the majority committee or majority report, if you please, would lead us into the building up of a judicial system in the Socialist Party. It would mean that we would have a reproduction eventually of all the various courts that the capitalist system has to-day, if we carry it to the logical conclusion. I maintain that the Socialist Party, if you adopt the majority report, would render itself unable to cope with the issues of its own organization. I claim that any attempt on the part of any state or any other division except the smallest division of the party, the local, and any attempt by any other part of the organization to act as a court, would have the same effect as if we were to accept the majority report and create a supreme court.

The Supreme Court of the Socialist Party, if there should be such a thing, should certainly not be the National Executive Committee. The National Executive Committee has something more to do besides settling the quarrels of you and me in our individual capacity. This would be to defeat the entire proposition, which should be something along the line of making the local itself responsible for its own action. I am not going to have the

National Executive Committee, or even a State Executive Committee, in local matters control my destiny, for the simple reason, that if the local itself is not able to cope with its own committees, its own members, how is the State going to do it? What do you know about little local and personal differences? I know that in Chicago, which is as large a local as you have anywhere in the United States, we certainly have a series of continuous grievances and appeals, etc., but we were always able to settle our own difficulties. You have never yet seen an appeal from the Chicago organization to a higher court. We were always able to settle them. I assure you, comrades, we have our difficulties here as much as any where, but we are always able to settle them with our own Committee on Grievances and not appeal, and if there is any local in the Socialist Party of the United States that cannot settle its own affairs, especially grievances and appeal, it ought to go out of existence, because that local ought not to be recognized as a part of the Socialist Party. Now, I trust the congress will vote this proposition, the majority report, down. I am absolutely against the majority report for the reason that it would make more trouble than it would do away with, in the long run, and for that reason I am going to vote against it.

DEL. MAURER (Pa.): This is a question that has agitated the minds of the comrades in Pennsylvania for some time. I happen to have been a member of the State Executive Committee for several years, and my experience may be of some use in this case. We have had cases in Pennsylvania where a lot of branches were expelled and where individuals were expelled, and they invariably appealed to the State Committee. Now, we in those cases found it very difficult to find out just what the trouble was, and I can fancy what would happen on the National Executive Committee if they tried to do the way that we found we were unable to do as a State Executive Committee. We had a case in Steelton, where there was trouble with the branch. It took nearly a year for the State Committee to get at the truth. Both parties concerned, the local and the branch, gave contradictory reports of their grievances, and so on, and finally the State Executive Committee was compelled to send a man on the ground to make an investigation, and the upshot of it was that even the State Executive Committee did not see fit to act on any of these charges and

referred them to the convention, and we found that not one thing was ever brought on the floor of any State convention. Now, I favor this part of the amendment to the majority report which calls for ten per cent of the party membership to give their consent, because, if that were the rule, it would not permit some little cross road local to bring some small matter before the attention of 40,000 members of our party. They could not get the ten per cent, and for that reason I favor it. But I do oppose the idea of letting the thing go to the National Executive Committee. I think it should be left entirely to the State to settle their grievances, and if the injured party can get ten per cent of the members to agree that he should carry his case forward to the party membership, all right, but if not, I think the state ought to settle it, and if the state cannot, then he should be privileged to extend it to the party membership. I do not believe we would get such a case to the party membership.

The previous question was then moved and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is now on the substitute as offered by Comrade Simons for both the minority and majority. Comrade Simons' motion is the report of the majority of the committee with certain words added as to the ten per cent. Under the rules, as I understand it, both the minority and majority have a right to speak in closing. They have a right under the rules to fifteen minutes, but I am going to ask them both to take no longer than five or seven minutes at the most.

DEL. DE BELL: I want to speak, and two minutes is all I want.

DEL. GAYLORD: The proposition of the minority is very simple, and the simplicity of it has been brought out. If it is not necessary to reaffirm state autonomy, well, then, don't reaffirm it. But do not constitute seven elderly gentlemen or young people, some of whom may be women comrades, a Supreme Court to force back upon the state organization a man who may have come into a town unknown for the purpose of making trouble, and then, when he is fired, compel them to take him back. (Applause.) That is possible. Do you get it, now?

DEL. WHITE (Mass.): Not very probable, though.

DEL. GAYLORD: It has been not impossible under such conditions as existed for the last few years down in Wisconsin for crooked fellows calling themselves

Social Democrats, but ex-Republican politicians, to get in before we understood them. The state is the proper unit of organization. It is big enough to carry out its policies and has wisdom enough. If the state is not right on the question of Socialism and organization it will go to pieces. Comrade Berger, the organization will go down. Then they will come under another provision that is now in the constitution, which provides that when the membership falls below a certain number it can be declared unorganized. Then you can go to work again and build it up. When they are wrong they go to pieces, don't they? When they are right they will grow. But when they are right and growing you have no business to interfere in their state organization. Suppose a man has got in for the purpose of being a trouble maker in their organization. They ought to have the right to decide whether they will keep him or not. Now, some people are good people, as people. But they are like a grain of sand in a watch. When a grain of sand gets in a watch the only thing to do is to put it out. It is good sand, as sand, but it is a poor part of a watch.

A DELEGATE: It is in the wrong place.

DEL. GAYLORD: It is in the wrong place. It is good sand, but it won't do in a watch. An organization, made up of those who are to work together, should have the privilege of working together, and they cannot do it when you force somebody back in there that don't want to work together. Do you get it now? That is the problem of organization. We are to put together a machine that works, that works, that works, and doesn't have friction and heat. And you will have friction and heat if you allow that one particle in there that is not actually a part of the organization. You have got to hold these organizations together with the spirit of Socialism, and when they lack the spirit of Socialism they don't work, and when they have that spirit they go on with the work of the Socialist Party. But give the state unit freedom. It is big enough. Keep the hands of the nation off. I remember a man who got into our party in Wisconsin. We fired him, and since that time we know that he is a Pinkerton. He was a trouble maker in the organization. He could talk Socialism, all the phrases and holy words, and some that were unholy. But we found him out and we fired him. He was not a part of the works, understand. Afterward we discovered what he was. Now,

he might have taken his case to the National Executive Committee, and they, not knowing the man, not knowing the situation, not understanding the spirit of our organization, might have forced him back on us, where he would continue the work of disruption, and then we would have been in nice shape by this time. No, no, no.

DEL. DE BELL: I think it has been fairly demonstrated by the minority report that Wisconsin's interpretation of state autonomy is state tyranny. It puts a man out and doesn't give him a chance after you put him out.

DEL. GAYLORD: We don't do anything of that kind.

DEL. DE BELL: That is practically what you said right there. I can hear and understand English. But they would go farther than that. I want to say that the interpretation is different in different places. State autonomy is all right for some people. It does for certain conditions, but I don't want a municipality to dictate the destiny of the organization.

DEL. BERGER: State autonomy came up twelve years ago.

DEL. DE BELL: He talks about the Supreme Court. There is not a local, there is not a state, that doesn't select a committee, usually of five, to try all cases. You cannot deny that, and there is not a case that I know of where charges have been preferred against any member of the party—charges that were charges, charges of any importance—but what while it was pending upon that committee they were suspended. There is a possibility in different locals that some people might be illegally dealt with. If the Executive Committee is to have the supreme authority that you say it is, why don't you move that the right to appeal shall extend to the membership of the United States? But when you tell me that state autonomy implies the absolute control of the membership and that the state shall say whether they shall be in the Socialist movement or not, I will not accept that state autonomy. I stand for a National Socialist Party to determine the merits or demerits of the individual, and not the state. Now, there is the difference between our interpretations of state autonomy. I want the power lodged somewhere to determine who is and who is not a Socialist. There are some people in this congress who, if they got into some of those states, would not be Socialists because they would not stand in with certain people; they would not accept certain conditions that are exist-

ent. As a consequence of that they would be put out; not because they are not Socialists, but because, if you please, they would not stand for a certain rule. I say that without any apologies. I hope, if you haven't made up your minds to support Comrade Simons' amendment or substitute for the whole, that you will vote this whole thing down, because I think this expression of the intent of the committee would not be fair to the individual. I hope you will leave it as it is now. The time is coming when you are going to deal with this. That is all I have to say on it.

The substitute offered by Del. Simons was as follows:

"Art. II, Sec. 7: No member of the party shall be suspended or expelled without written charges and opportunity to be heard, and every member expelled by a local of the party shall have the right to appeal from the decision of expulsion to the membership of the state, and as a final resort to the National Executive Committee, provided said appeal is supported by at least ten per cent of the membership of the state from which the appeal comes."

The substitute was defeated by a vote of 52 to 38.

The report of the tellers on the vote for the Committee on Farmers' Programme showed the following elected to the committee: Delegates O'Hare, Hunter, Wright, Ameringer, Freeman, Maurer, in addition to the three members of the existing committee.

ROLL CALL.

Vote was then taken on the minority report as follows:

Alabama—No: C. G. Hutchisson.

Arizona—No: Jos. D. Cannon.

Arkansas—Absent or not voting: Stanley J. C. Clark.

California—No: W. Carpenter, J. Stitt Wilson, Ernest Untermann, John H. Wilde. Absent or not voting: J. B. Osborne.

Colorado—No: W. P. Collins, Mila T. Maynard.

Connecticut—Yes: Ella Reeves Bloor, Jasper McLevy.

Florida—Yes: C. C. Allen.

Idaho—Yes: T. J. Coonrod.

Illinois—No: G. T. Fraenckel, T. J. Morgan, A. W. Nelson, G. A. Peterson, A. M. Simons. Absent or not voting: Robert Giese, A. M. Lewis.

Indiana—No: S. M. Reynolds. Absent or not voting: O'Neil.

Iowa—Yes: John M. Work. No: J. J. Jacobsen.

Kansas—No: Geo. D. Brewer, Caroline A. Lowe, Kate Richards O'Hare.

Kentucky—Yes: Walter Lanfersiek.

Louisiana—No: J. W. Barnes.

Maine—No: Grace V. Silver.

Maryland—Absent or not voting: W. M. Coleman.

Masachusetts—No: James A. De Bell, James F. Carey, Harriet D'Orsay, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr., Dan A. White. Absent or not voting: Marion Craig Wentworth.

Michigan—No: Frank Aaltonen, J. Hoogerhyde. Absent or not voting: Henry Kummerfeld.

Minnesota—No: Morris Kaplan, Leo Laukki, Mrs. Esther Laukki. Yes: J. E. Nash.

Missouri—No: W. W. McAllister. Absent or not voting: E. T. Behrens, W. L. Garver.

Montana—Yes: Geo. W. McDermott. Nebraska—No: Clyde J. Wright.

Nevada—No: W. H. Burton.

New Hampshire—Yes: John P. Burke.

New Jersey—Yes: Max Fackert, Geo. H. Goebel, Frank Hubschmitt. No: W. B. Killingbeck.

New Mexico—No: C. B. Lane. New York—Yes: Algernon Lee. No:

Jos. Wanhope, W. W. Passage, C. L. Furman, Park Dills, Gustave Strebel, Frank Cassidy. Absent or not voting: Morris Hillquit, H. Schefer.

North Dakota—Absent or not voting: Arthur Bassett.

Ohio—No: E. E. Adel, D. P. Farrell, Marguerie Prevey, L. A. Zitt. Yes: Miller, John G. Willert.

Oklahoma—Yes: Oscar Ameringer, Winnie E. Branstetter, J. T. Cumbie. No: G. W. Davis.

Oregon—Yes: E. L. Cannon, Tom J. Lewis.

Pennsylvania—Yes: Jos. E. Cohen, Fred H. Merrick, Thos. F. Kennedy, Edward Moore, Jas. H. Maurer, Robert B. Ringler, Adams.

Rhode Island—Yes: Fred Hurst.

South Dakota—Yes: E. Francis Atwood.

Tennessee—No: T. H. Haines.

Texas—No: W. J. Bell, W. W. Buchanan, P. G. Zimmerman.

Utah—Absent or not voting: W. Thurston Brown.

Washington—Yes: Mrs. E. D. Cory. No: W. H. Waynick.

West Virginia—Absent or not voting: Harold W. Houston.

Wisconsin—No: Victor L. Berger. Yes:

W. R. Gaylord, Emil Seidel, Carl D. Thompson.

Wyoming—Yes: W. L. O'Neil. Absent or not voting: John Heckala.

Delaware—Yes: J. Frank Smith.

Georgia—Absent or not voting: Paul Hochscheid.

Mississippi—Absent or not voting: S. W. Rose.

North Carolina—Yes: Rufus J. Morton.

South Carolina—Yes: A. J. Royal.

Virginia—Absent or not voting: E. B. Slatton.

The minority report was defeated by a vote of 53 to 37, 18 absent or not voting.

The majority report was then adopted as follows:

"Art. II, Sec. 7. No member of the party shall be suspended or expelled without written charges and opportunity to be heard, and every member expelled by a local of the party shall have the right to appeal from the decision of expulsion to the membership of the state, and as the final resort to the National Executive Committee."

The report of the committee on Article III, Section 1, was then adopted, after the words, "national congresses," had been added on the suggestion of Chairman Gaylord.

On motion of Chairman Gaylord, the proposed Section 4 of Article VI, as reported by the committee and slightly modified, was adopted as follows:

"Art. VI, Sec. 4. The National Executive Committee shall transmit copies of the minutes of its meetings to all members of the National Committee. Such minutes shall also be published in the Monthly Bulletin. Any act of the National Executive Committee, unless called in question by a member of the National Committee within fifteen days after notice of such act has been mailed by the National Office to the members of the National Committee, shall be in force."

Article VII, Sec. 3, as reported by the committee, was adopted as follows:

"Art. VII, Sec. 3. The National Secretary shall issue to all party organizations Monthly Bulletins which contain all important official reports and announcements; a report of the financial affairs of the party; a summary of the conditions and the membership of the several states and territorial organizations; the principal business transacted by the National officials and such other matters pertaining to the organization of the party as may be of general interest to the membership. No personal correspondence shall be published."

"The Bulletin shall be largely given to accounts of the more important organization and propaganda work of the national, state, territorial and local organizations and to the work, discussion and explanation of new and effective methods of organization, education and propaganda."

Article VII, Sec. 4, was then adopted as follows:

"Sec. 4. The National Secretary shall be empowered to secure such help as may be necessary for the proper transaction of the business of the National Office. Such employees may be discharged by the National Secretary, the National Executive Committee, or the National Committee."

Article VII, Sec. 5, was then adopted as follows:

"Sec. 5. The National Secretary and the National Executive Committee may be recalled by the party membership."

Article VII, Sec. 6, was then adopted as follows:

"Sec. 6. The National Secretary may be temporarily recalled by the National Executive Committee pending a referendum to the party membership which shall be immediately initiated by the National Executive Committee."

Article VII, Sec. 7, was adopted as follows:

"Sec. 7. Any members or member of the National Executive Committee may be temporarily recalled by a majority of the National Committee pending a referendum to the party membership which shall be immediately initiated by the National Committee."

DEL. GAYLORD: It is moved to strike out Sec. 2 as it appears in the black faced type, and adopt instead of that the section on the opposite side as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Lecture Bureau shall have the right to make arrangements for special lectures under its auspices with all state organizations of the party, Chautauquas or other organizations, charging such lecturers a commission for services rendered in arranging such tours."

The old Section 3 of Article VIII was stricken out and the new section reported by the committee was adopted as follows:

"Sec. 3. The National Committee shall establish a uniform rate of compensation for all lecturers and organizers working for wages under its auspices."

The new Section 4 of the same Article was then adopted, as follows:

"Sec. 4. Bulletins, statements and reports shall distinguish between organizing tours and lecture tours."

Chairman Gaylord then read the pro-

posed new Section 5, as follows:

"Reports of results obtained by organizers shall state the number of members secured and the number of locals organized."

DEL. BERGER: I do not believe that this would be a just procedure so far as the organizers are concerned. It encourages humbug on the part of the organizers. In one part of the country there may be a big strike on and the organizer may easily organize a big local, many of whom may drop out after the trouble is over. Another organizer may work harder in a different field and organize a local of fighting members that will do a lot of work. I do not know that I have a substitute just at this moment, but why do we have this at all? I move that this section be stricken out.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): There ought to be some way of finding out what our organizers are doing. Heretofore we have never been able to find out anything except a short statement in the monthly bulletin. We do not know whether their work is really effective or not. Paper is patient and you can print anything you want on paper; it won't kick. I think the membership should know whether there is any result from that work or not.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): I agree with Comrade Berger, that this will encourage humbug. We have trouble down in Pennsylvania and there an organizer can go and do a lot of work and make a splendid report. I am not in favor of leading people into temptation. We don't want cooked reports; we want raw material. We have a very good way now of judging to some degree of the work being done; the state organizations can tell pretty well by the amount of dues being paid in. We don't want to encourage organizers to go out for the purpose of getting good reports instead of getting good membership material.

THE CHAIRMAN: Every national organizer has a blank furnished by the National Office with a space for every day, and he makes an exact report of how much he spends and how he spends it; what locals he organizes; and all that sort of thing, and the number of members; you are doing all those things now.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): If Comrade Goebel had divulged this information, he would probably have changed the opinion of the committee. He did not give this kind of information when this was drawn and every member knows he did not. He was one of the organizers who claimed

that other people were getting credit for the work he was doing.

There can be nothing lost by the adoption of this, and if anyone makes a false report you can easily get at it. There is nothing lost and a great deal to be gained.

On a division the motion to strike out the proposed section of the report was declared carried by a vote of 33 ayes and 28 noes.

Chairman Gaylord then read and moved the adoption of Article X, Sec. 6, which he read as follows:

"Article X, Sec. 6. Railroad fare of the delegates going to and coming from conventions and the congresses of the party and \$3.00 per day shall be paid to the elected delegates of all states, territories and foreign language speaking delegates.

"The National Secretary shall have printed and distributed to all states, territories and unorganized states and foreign language speaking sections uniform special assessment stamps at 25 cents each, to be purchased by members, and all members must buy at least one special stamp within four months after issue to be in good standing.

"All funds from special stamps sold by State Locals or Foreign Language Branches shall be turned over to the National Secretary, and in the event of the assessment failing to meet the expenses of the delegates, the difference shall be paid out of the general fund."

Del. Kaplan moved to lay the section as read on the table; which motion was defeated.

DEL. Lee: As chairman of the Resolutions Committee I have received a letter which should have gone to the Constitution Committee. It relates to a technical change. The local at Honolulu thinks we should say "transportation" instead of "railroad fare" as they may wish to send a delegate to this convention and it might be found to be difficult to reach this country from Honolulu by rail.

DEL. GAYLORD: The committee will accept the change.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I believe that the delegates to this convention should be paid. It is an outrage to expect delegates elected to these conventions to come here and pay their own railroad fare and their own hotel bills. At the present time we all pay our own expenses. We are here selected by the party membership to represent them and yet we are expected to pay our own hotel bills. I believe we are expected to do as good work as the men who are organizing, and we ought

to get as much money as those that are out organizing.

A DELEGATE: Can't you have the states provide for the expenses, outside of the transportation?

DEL. BERGER: You can make it any way so that we get as much as an organizer; we ought to get as much as that anyway. Our state pays organizers twenty-eight dollars a week and expenses. Now, I don't want you to pay as much as our state pays the state organizers. I had to borrow some money to-day from the City Clerk of Milwaukee—

A DELEGATE: City money?

DEL. COHEN: I hope this will carry, because as the sessions of the conventions are prolonged, the poorer delegates often have to go home before the convention is over because they can't afford to remain longer.

DEL. BERGER: Yes; Hunter and Spargo have already gone.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I don't believe this should be left to the states. This is a national convention and the national party should pay the expenses.

DEL. BELL (Tex.): I don't think it was quite fair to put these two provisions in one paragraph.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to divide the section.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection we will divide the section.

The motion to pay the transportation of all delegates to conventions and congresses of the party was declared carried.

The question as to whether the delegates should be paid three dollars per day during the convention was then declared by the chairman to be before the house.

DEL. LANFERSIEK (Ky.): This does not treat the delegates the same as the organizers, because the organizers are paid their expenses in addition.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): At the beginning of these conventions the delegates were compelled to pay all their expenses, car fare, and lose their time, and all. The trouble with that was that only the states and individuals who could afford it sent their delegates, and we had conventions composed largely of little bourgeois business men. Now, the object was to get the proletariat here, and the next move was to get at least the railroad fare. Many of the delegates who came had collections taken up. Now it is proposed to pay three dollars a day. Let us go step by step and next convention we may find it is all right and go a step further and

agree to pay the expenses of delegates. Let us see how this works out. I think it should be adopted as printed here.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): I think we ought to do a little figuring on this. Transportation was paid in order to equalize the distance that comrades would have to come. Now, when it comes to paying expenses, each locality is equal on that. The expenses of the delegates from California and from Chicago are equal. The next convention, if we have 300 delegates at three dollars a day, that means nine hundred dollars, or nearly seven thousand dollars for a week's convention. Now, we are simply voting the impossible. Then it says it should come out of the general fund. That means that we might not be able to hold a convention. It seems to me it would be much better to urge upon the states that they pay all they can. Let us hold the transportation matter as it is now. We are undertaking something that we cannot carry out. No one would like to see it done more than I; although it would not affect me.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I come from a state that voted against this congress. If I go back to Allegheny with the record of having voted to pile up more expenses for another congress I shall hear from the people at home. While I concede that it is more democratic when you hold these congresses to pay these expenses, but it tends to encourage holding these congresses, and this one has already proved they are of very little use. But, if you believe in these things, be consistent and go to the limit and say that every cent of expense from the time the delegate leaves home shall be paid. But there is a growing opposition to these congresses among the rank and file of the country, and you are adding to it if you adopt this.

DEL. FACKERT (N. J.): I am opposed to this. It would make it too entirely comfortable for the delegates. And if we collect from our states we shall have to show good reasons for the collection. There are some states now that pay the expenses of the delegates and I think that it should be left with the states. It gives the state some sort of hold on the delegates.

DEL. SCHNAIDT (Ohio): The delegates at such congresses as this are always ready to pile expenses on the rank and file and it is so at labor congresses. But when you take the cash out of their own pockets, then they are not ready to do it. I think the transportation is amply

sufficient and let the states deal with the expenses as they wish. The state of Ohio made up its expenses by a special assessment, or out of the party treasury. Two years from now, when the state of Ohio will have twenty-one delegates, if the state cannot afford to pay my expenses, I will pay my own. Another point; there are a number of men who are already in

the pay of the party; and under this clause they could collect twice. There are a lot here that would be entitled to double pay. Let us stop at the transportation; some of us are ahead even at that. There are men here who have their transportation. Let the transportation remain and let the states attend to the expenses.

Adjourned until 2 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Goebel called the Congress to order at 2 o'clock P. M.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): To test the feeling of the delegates and to see if they want to hold a night session, I move you that we hold a meeting to-night, beginning at eight o'clock. (Seconded.)

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I move as a substitute that we hire this hall for to-morrow. (Seconded.)

The motion of Delegate Work was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: No night session to-night, and a session to-morrow; that is what it means.

REPORT ON CONSTITUTION.

Consideration of the report of the Committee on Constitution was resumed.

DEL. STREBEL: I move the previous question upon the article under discussion.

The motion was seconded and carried. THE CHAIRMAN: We will now proceed to a vote. The question will be divided in voting. The chairman of the committee will make the closing remarks, and then we will proceed to the vote.

DEL. GAYLORD: The question, as I understand it, on the first paragraph, or the question as divided, is whether or not the party is to pay the \$3 a day. That is the question, I believe, is it not?

THE CHAIRMAN: What we are going to vote on is the entire section as it stands, but we are going to vote first on the \$3 a day proposition, and then upon the assessment or voluntary proposition.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is the question as divided?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is the way it will be. Now, I want to suggest that there is one thing perhaps that you will permit the committee to make clear, only for the sake of clearness; I do not want any debate at all. There would be some lack of clearness, and so it should be determined first whether or not the \$3 per day shall be for the time during

which the delegates are going and coming, or whether it should be simply for the time during which a convention is in session. On behalf of the committee I would suggest that we do not go too far if we insert "\$3 per day during the sessions of the convention." Is there any objection?

DEL. DE BELL: On the part of the committee I object to that.

DEL. GAYLORD: Very well.

After considerable more discussion and an appeal from a ruling of the Chair by Del. Bell (Tex.), the Chair being sustained, a vote was taken and resulted in the defeat of Section 6, of Article X, by a vote of 23 in favor and 29 against.

DEL. SIMONS: A point of information. I understand we have just now defeated the last section, and there is now left the original section?

DEL. GAYLORD: The original section stands.

The next section of the report, being new Section 8 of Article X, was read, as follows:

"Sec. 8. All national platforms, amendments of platforms, and resolutions, adopted by any National Convention or Congress, shall be submitted seriatim to a referendum vote of the membership. One-fourth of the regularly elected delegates to have alternative paragraphs submitted at the same time, such alternative paragraphs signed by one-fourth of such delegates shall be filed with the National Secretary not later than one day after the adjournment of the convention."

DEL. MERRICK: A point of information. Does that affect the amending of the constitution?

DEL. GAYLORD: Not adversely under present conditions, excepting it makes it possible for one-fourth of the regularly elected delegates to any convention or congress, by filing with the secretary at the national office a proposition, to have it submitted with the balance. It is a movement in the direction of democracy.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): It seems to me that it would be very good practice

AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 20, 1910

to submit all alternative propositions for referendum so as to give the form as it stands originally and the proposed amendment. I think that ought always to go with the referendum so that they will have both before them, and I would not be in favor of this proposition making it necessary for one-fourth of the delegates to ask that they go out, but I would make a constitutional provision that it always go that way. I move to strike out that proposition and change it so that when platforms or constitutions are submitted, that both forms shall be submitted together seriatim.

DEL. GAYLORD: Do you mean motions proposed from the floor and everything else?

DEL. THOMPSON: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: Those adopted and those not?

DEL. THOMPSON: No, those that are agreed upon in the convention are sent out.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is to adopt the article as read. Do I understand that Comrade Thompson amends?

DEL. THOMPSON: Yes, I want to amend it. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: There is only one difficulty about that thing. Sometimes there is a motion, an amendment, and an amendment to the amendment, and then a substitute to the amendment and substitute for the whole. Now, we would have to submit all three, four or five propositions in order to be fair, and this would make it so much harder for the membership to decide among four or five different theories put before them, and it is harder for them to vote intelligently. The referendum is a comparatively new thing in this country, and if you knew how difficult it is for the Socialist Party to legislate with the referendum you would not make it any harder than you have it. Make it as easy as possible. When we submit an amendment to the constitution in Wisconsin, and as far as I know in other states, we submit the original amendment, and then right next to it the proposed change. That would be satisfactory, but do not submit any more propositions or amendments, which would make it so much harder and mix them up.

DEL. KILLINGBECK: I move the adoption of that paragraph.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion. The motion is to adopt the paragraph as read, and Comrade Thompson

moves to amend. He is now writing it out and putting it in words.

DEL. SIMONS: I want to understand Comrade Berger. A great many times, those who have submitted an alternative motion or have submitted a substitute, before the thing finally comes to a vote have withdrawn it or changed their minds, and it is simply foolish to burden the membership with all these matters. We have already the possibility of invoking a vote of the entire membership as easily almost as to call the roll of yeas and nays on this floor, and it seems to me we ought not to make it as easy to call for a vote of 40,000 people as it is to ask for the yeas and nays here. There is no question but what there is never a motion that you could by any possibility submit that would not get at least one-fourth of the delegates present. It seems to me that is going to be confusing.

DEL. THOMPSON: A point of information. If you will let the Secretary read the amendment as I dictated it to him just now, it will clear the matter up.

The Secretary read: "Thompson, of Wisconsin, moves to amend Sec. 8 by striking out all that follows after the word 'membership' in the fifth line, beginning with the words 'one-fourth of the regularly elected delegates,' from there to the conclusion of that section he desires to have stricken out, and in its place to substitute the following: 'All recommendations agreed upon by the Congress shall be submitted to the referendum seriatim, both the original paragraphs and the alternative paragraphs thus agreed upon to be submitted to the referendum.'"

DEL. GAYLORD: A point of information. I want to ask Comrade Barnes whether it is the practice, in sending out national referendums, to submit the original constitution together with such new paragraphs as are proposed, and where in the convention it is proposed to adopt other paragraphs, whether all of these are submitted to the referendum at the same time.

SEC. BARNES: Following the convention of 1908, the old constitution and the amendments affecting the same, were printed in parallel columns, and I presume by an error or misunderstanding the National Secretary had instructions on the ballot that they could vote either for the old provision or the substitute provision. That was changed, so that they could only vote on the substitute provisions. Since then all ballots on amendments to the constitution have carried the old

section and the proposed amendment, but they only vote on the amendment.

DEL. SCHNAIDT (Ohio): If we adopt Comrade Thompson's amendment I do not see that there is any use in our voting on this question, because we are now deciding which will be the matters for the party membership to vote on. If we adopt his amendment, then everything that comes before these various committees should be inserted in the referendum, and there is no use in holding a convention.

DEL. THOMPSON: It means only what is finally decided.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is not what you say.

DEL. SCHNAIDT: That is exactly what we want to do, what we are finally deciding on, but with this amendment everything would go to the referendum. I am in favor of wiping that whole section out and simply vote that the congress is to decide which article is and which is not to be brought before the referendum of the party. That is what we are sent here for, and if we do not do that, we don't need to hold any convention, and everybody can submit their articles for consideration to the various committees and they will go in the referendum and we will vote on them, and we will have about fifteen or twenty different propositions. Now, we are here to decide what shall go before the party, and that only, and I think this section is superfluous.

DEL. KILLINGBECK: I move the previous question.

Motion seconded and carried.

DEL. GAYLORD: The chairman of the committee has a word to say in closing. I do not think it is quite clear, from what has been said. Comrade Thompson wishes to have all matters that are finally decided upon submitted in referendum form.

DEL. BERGER: He did not say that.

DEL. THOMPSON: That is what I say.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is the present practice, according to Secretary Barnes' report. What we wish is something more than that. What we wish is to say that if there are one-fourth of the delegates who are sufficiently in earnest about a matter and believe that the congress is wrong and that the matter should go to a referendum, they have the right to have that submitted to referendum, whether it has come before the convention or not, but you must file it within twenty-four hours of the adjournment of the congress. It is not at all improbable that it

might be a good thing, and I think it is a vast improvement upon the Thompson proposition, inasmuch as all that he proposes is to crystallize in formal action what is already the practice.

DEL. THOMPSON: If you leave it so as to put everything in, I will agree to that.

DEL. GAYLORD: It is not necessary. That is the practice now in submitting the constitution, anyhow.

The amendment was adopted, and the Article as amended was adopted.

The next section of the report was read, amending Section 1 of Article XI by substituting the word "forty" for "twenty" in line seven, and adding the following at the end of the section: "Provided, the necessary number of seconds shall have been received within 60 days of publication in the Bulletin. The vote on such referendum shall close fifty days from date of submission thereof," so as to make the section read as follows:

"Sec. 1. Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the National Secretary to a referendum of the party membership, upon the request of forty local organizations, in five or more states or territories, or any smaller number of local organizations in three states having two thousand members in the aggregate; provided, the necessary number of seconds shall have been received within sixty days of publication in the Bulletin. The vote on such referendum shall close fifty days from date of submission thereof."

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section as amended.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I move to amend so that the section shall read: "Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the National Secretary to a referendum of the party membership upon the request of locals representing at least five per cent of the entire membership of the party on the basis of dues paid in the preceding year. The vote on every such referendum shall close fifty days from the date of its submission."

The amendment was seconded.

DEL. LEE: This involves two differences from the committee's report. We are, I believe, pretty generally agreed—and when I say we, I do not only mean the delegates here, but I believe that it can be truly said of the party membership generally; that we are pretty generally

agreed that the provision for referendums has been ridiculously lax, especially in view of the fact that the party membership and the number of locals have increased vastly from year to year. It was very low when we put it out two years ago. There has been a very great increase in membership in two years. There will probably be a still greater increase within the next two years.

With the present rapidly growing condition of the party and with the presidential campaign coming on within two years from now, we may expect a very greatly increased membership. Now, the committee proposes merely to double the number of locals required to initiate a referendum, making it forty instead of twenty. We have 3,200 locals at the present time, when we propose to allow forty to initiate a referendum. These 3,200 locals, in all probability, not in two years, but in one year, will have grown to at least 4,000. The provision which I move will considerably increase the number of locals that would probably be required, unless, indeed, most of those locals were decidedly large ones. It puts the thing, I believe, upon a much fairer basis. I think it is a very liberal provision when it provides that five per cent of the membership, based on the average during the preceding year, may initiate a referendum, and I do not think it is necessary to discriminate as to whether this number comes from within one or two or three states or more. It seems to me that the five per cent provision, which is one that will regulate the number of persons demanding it automatically along with the growth of the party, is a very simple proposition, and is by no means putting the limit too high. Personally I think it is too low, but it is by no means putting it too high; while the present provision, even with the different amendments, I believe, leaves it in such a position that the party can be tied up with referendum which can be acted on by but a small part of the party membership, and which may be carried, as some of them have been carried, to the great surprise of the party membership, and then reversed within a few months. I therefore move the adoption of the amendment.

DEL. KENNEDY (Pa.): Two locals in Pennsylvania can initiate a referendum, under the amendment, if that is incorporated.

DEL. SIMONS: As I understand, it will read that referendums shall be on the request of forty locals located in five or more states or territories, or any

smaller number of locals in three states embracing at least five per cent of the members.

DEL. LEE: It would be by locals representing five per cent of the membership and located in at least three states. That is what I mean.

DEL. SIMONS: That is what I meant to say.

DEL. LEE: The sense is perhaps the same.

DEL. SIMONS: Then you would cross out "or a smaller number of locals in three states?"

DEL. LEE: Yes.

DEL. SIMONS: Then the amendment would read: "At the request of organizations in five or more states or territories embracing five per cent of the membership?" Then you would have nothing to do except to get that number.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read the substitute as proposed by Comrade Lee, so that we will know what we are doing.

THE SECRETARY: There have been so many suggestions made as to how this should be amended that I am not absolutely certain this is correct, but I believe it is: Comrade Lee moves to amend Article II, Section 1, to read as follows: "Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the National Secretary to a referendum of the party membership upon the request of locals representing at least five per cent of the entire membership of the party and located in at least five states, on the basis of dues paid in the preceding year."

DEL. LEE: May I say that I did not intend in my motion to leave out that provision of the committee report, that the necessary number of seconds shall have been received within sixty days from the publication of the motion? That was my error. Otherwise that is perfectly correct.

The Secretary read the remainder of Delegate Lee's amendment, as follows: "The vote on every such referendum shall close fifty days from the date of its submission."

DEL. BERGER: As I understand the referendum, and as it is understood where it has been used, it is an appeal to the membership without any regard to locals or branches. That is how I understood it. I remember that five years ago the state of Wisconsin voted on a referendum put out on the motion of a little branch

in Crestline, Ohio, which, through the kindness of the National Secretary at that time, had the privilege of getting enough seconds, and if it had not been for the good sense of the membership at large, the referendum would have carried. I think we ought to block things of that kind, and I believe the referendum ought to be based upon the individual membership and not on the locals. As it is now, a little local of five members counts for as much as Local Chicago or Local New York or Philadelphia or Milwaukee. Now, that is ridiculously unjust. The entire membership ought to be the basis. Furthermore, we ought to be sure that the members asking for the referendum are members in good standing. We ought to demand that everybody signing the demand for a referendum for a city or state should be in good standing, to be attested by the local secretary. In other words, if twenty members of Local Chicago sign something, then their respective secretaries ought to attest that these twenty or fifty or one hundred members, as the case may be, are in good standing. We ought to make this a fundamental rule. As for the rest, I am perfectly willing to adopt it, except the substitute of Comrade Lee.

Delegate Killingbeck (N. J.) was called to the chair.

DEL. GOEBEL: If I were asked as to the particular part of the work of this congress that I am more interested in than anything else, it would be this matter that you have before you now. It is all right to talk about being flooded with referendums. Now let us sit down quietly for a moment and figure just how great has been the abuse that we hear so much about. I want to say this: we hear lots of talk about intellectuals and of the proletariat. We hear lots of talk about controlling things, running things. As far as I am concerned, I have not seen it. They talk about mistakes. I am willing to take every one of the referendums of this party, and after all, if you will, take the referendums that we have had, the worst of them, they have not proved such great mistakes. I would like to have some one stand on this floor and tell me one mistake—even though the mistake was made temporarily—I would like to have you tell me of one mistake that stood on the constitution books of this party for six months or a year. After they made a mistake they were very quick to find the mistake, and at the same time they had all the advantage of having the power in their hands. Now, the only

reason we have had any trouble from the referendum has been because there has been absolutely no limit upon the time during which seconds might be made to a proposed referendum. One referendum that I have in mind was left open for over eight months. We have had one other. By the time the eight months had gone by twenty seconds had been received for that referendum. If that referendum, when it went out, had stated as it does in the amendment proposed by your committee, it would have stated that the necessary seconds would be required within sixty days, and it would never have got to the membership at all. What is it that is proposed? Two thousand members. Now, five per cent of 40,000 means that 2,000 members shall be required before we shall have a referendum. The membership has not doubled, but we have doubled the number of seconds required, and they are required to have them within sixty days. Under the old way, how many referendums did you have? How many referendums have we had during the past year? Take the referendum on the election of officers and national committeemen, and I really think that if the referendum served no other useful purpose, if it had no additional reason, it was justified in that case. I claim that what we have proposed to-day is no more than to make the matter more definite. I claim that every time we send out a referendum upon the party officers or upon any provision of the constitution, to that extent we are educating the rank and file. Let us take the position made by your committee. It has doubled the number of seconds required, making it forty instead of twenty, keeping the control of the party in the hands of the membership, and yet avoiding unnecessary referendums.

Del Goebel resumed the chair.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): I do not want to see anything done that will make it harder for the membership to get a referendum if they want it. I want to see this movement stay in the hands of the rank and file. I would rather see party conventions wiped out. I would rather never have another one, than to see the referendum curtailed in the least. Will this amendment make it harder to deal with, harder for the little back country local to get a referendum of the party membership than it will under the one drawn by the committee? If it will, I am against the amendment. I am for making the referendum as democratic as possible.

DEL. RINGLER (Pa.): I want to call the attention of the delegates to the fact that the word "Local" represents different ideas in different portions of the country. Local Pittsburgh consists of 800 members, while a local in the back districts may consist of five members. The way this is worded to-day 200 persons might call a referendum of the party membership, because these 200 members might compose forty locals of five members apiece. I think the plan last suggested would be better, because it gives a more definite basis for basing the referendum upon. I also favor the idea that persons applying for a referendum should be certified to as being in good standing. As a state secretary, I know something about this. I am much interested in having something at least scientific or logical or democratic.

DEL. BELL (Tex.): There is only one question that I care to discuss. I do not see any objection to requiring certificates by the secretaries that the persons applying for the referendum are in good standing. That is all well and good. But don't be too hasty about placing a limited time, and don't give us sixty days; give us not less than ninety days. That might seem a long time to you, but I know it is not a long time to the people in the agricultural districts. There are many reasons that I could give you why we ought to make it not less than ninety days. If you can't do it in the ninety days, all right; but don't make it sixty days.

DEL. M'LEVY (Conn.): I am in favor of Lee's amendment, making it five per cent of the membership of the state instead of on the basis of the locals. But I believe with the comrade who just said that we should not place a short time limit on it. The time required for the seconds should be long, for this reason: After it is started it is a month before it appears in the party bulletin, and then, before the members that are going to sign this petition know what they are signing, they have got to discuss it in their locals, and a reasonable time should be allowed for the discussion of any proposed referendum that comes up. For that reason I believe we should make it ninety days instead of sixty.

DEL. GAYLORD: It will not be difficult at any time within ninety days to start a referendum on some question within the party organization, if you go after it. That is not what you want. All that is wanted is liberty to make changes that are necessary between conventions and congresses. We are not choking them

off. We have added additional leeway in the presentation of matters that come before the congress or do not come before the congress at the time the congress or convention meets. Sixty days is time enough, if there is anything necessary for the life of the party and for the activity of the party. Don't open the door too wide. There has been a good deal of resentment among the party membership at playing with the referendum in these last two years. There has, and you know it. We have tried to overcome that. Forty locals is enough; if you make that simply five per cent of the vote of the state it won't be very hard to get them through.

The question was then put on the adoption of the substitute and it was carried.

DEL. GAYLORD: It is proposed to strike out Section 2 because of the amendment of Section 1, and since in the substitute there has been included, as I understand it, that which was proposed by the committee in the amendment to Section 1, I think it will be all right to strike out Section 2 as it stands. The committee so recommends.

DEL. LEE: I so move.

The motion to strike out was seconded and carried.

DEL. GAYLORD: Section 10 of Article XII: It is proposed simply to strike out the words: "Who shall be selected as far as possible from the section in which the state is located." This is the story: When states are declared unorganized or are otherwise unorganized, the Executive Committee may appoint secretaries to reside there and their salaries may be paid. This, as it at present stands, says that they shall be selected, as far as possible, from the section where they are to do their work. If it is in California, select them as far as possible from the section where they are to do their work. It is simply confusing, and the Executive Committee will select the men anyhow.

The recommendation of the committee was concurred in and the words stricken out.

DEL. GAYLORD: Article XIII stands as it is. Article XIV, Section 1: It is proposed to strike out the section as it stands in the present constitution and substitute therefor the following:

"Sec. 1. Delegates to the International Socialist Congress shall be elected by referendum in the year in which the Congress is held. The call for nominations shall be made on the 1st day of January. The election shall be conducted in the

same manner as the election of the members of the National Executive Committee. There shall be one delegate for every 5,000 members, ascertained by computing the average membership for the preceding year. The next highest in the election shall be the alternates. The expense of the delegates, and a per diem equal to the per diem fixed for national organizers and lecturers, shall be paid out of the national treasury."

It was moved and seconded to substitute the section as reported for the section as it now stands.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I would like to ask for a little more explanation. The last sentence says that the expense of the delegates, and a per diem equal to the per diem fixed for national organizers and lecturers, shall be paid out of the national treasury. Now long a time does this usually cover?

DEL. GAYLORD: Delegates Simons or Delegate Berger can answer that question.

DEL. BERGER: There is an International Congress held, as a rule, every three years; every four, but as a rule every three.

DEL. MERRICK: I want to get at about what the total expense would be on that.

DEL. BERGER: The cost of the entire trip depends usually on the boat you take. You can take a ten-day boat or you can take an eight-day boat, and some steamers take a little longer. The first-rate boats are more expensive, but what you save one way you have to pay out another. You can make the trip in about four weeks nicely.

DEL. MERRICK: I move to amend so that the last sentence shall read: "The expense of delegates shall be paid out of the national treasury." (Seconded.)

The amendment was put to a vote and was lost.

DEL. DE BELL: I move to adopt the original recommendation. (Seconded.)

DEL. LEE: The word "expense" is an ambiguous word. Now, I take it that the committee meant to pay transportation and three dollars a day. Did they mean transportation and living expenses and three dollars a day? I would like to know about that.

DEL. SIMONS: That is what I want a ruling on. That is the reason I seconded the motion, because as it stands there, it is necessary to pay the international delegates, in addition to their transportation and hotel, the three dollars a day.

DEL. LEE: If it is in order I would

move to amend or substitute the words "Cost of transportation" for the word "Expense." Will the committee accept that?

DEL. GAYLORD: The committee did not so understand it and did not so intend. It was definitely threshed out in the committee to this effect: that we have understood that Comrade Hillquit could go and some one else could go because they could afford to spend the time. There are others whom we would like to have go who are working men, and we think they ought to have enough to support the babies, as some one has said, and the railroad fare and the hotel bill. If there is anything else involved in necessary expense, well, that must go too. If you have got to pay other things, they should be covered. That is why I asked Berger and Simons to explain.

DEL. SIMONS: There is one expense in traveling in Europe which it is well to remember—the tip. You cannot get around without it. I tried it once on the boat and I will never do it again. That is the difficulty in making this something definite, transportation expense and three dollars a day, or transportation, hotel and three dollars a day. If it is going to cover no more than transportation, don't put "Expense" in. I think my expenses were \$250.00 for six weeks.

DEL. GAYLORD: Did that include the tips?

DEL. SIMONS: It included tips and everything.

DEL. AMERINGER (Okla.): I would like to know whether the Socialist Party is an organization for the purpose of reducing wages? There is not a labor union in the United States that exploits its employees so bitterly as the Socialist Party. I have heard of the Brewery Workers' Union, big-footed Dutchmen, who make their living by hard work, and they paid their organizers three dollars a day and five dollars for expenses. Shall a national party of the United States be so measly as to demand that their international representatives stop in a shabby Gasthouse over in Europe? No; let us be a little bit businesslike. Is the Socialist Party of this country so poor as to be unable to pay its representatives to an international congress \$3 a day, when others pay \$5 and expenses and all transportation? If so, then for Heaven's sake let us go out of business.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): I come from a district where we are endeavoring and succeeding in getting working men into the party. The average wages there in

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): Do I understand Comrade Lee's motion as meaning to pay \$3 a day and pay the expense only?

DEL. GAYLORD: There is the transportation and expense, so that it will read, "Transportation of delegates and per diem," etc.

DEL. DE BELL: That includes \$3 a day?

DEL. GAYLORD: Whatever the per diem of national organizers may be.

DEL. DE BELL: I am in favor of that if it brings that out clearly. The reason I am in favor of it is this: As the matter stands at the present time, four weeks' average time to and from the sessions of the congress makes it so that the working man could not exist; that is all there is to that. If \$3, in the interpretation of our Pennsylvania comrade, means grafters, then I must say that his interpretation is a very poor one, and if the \$9 a week, which I know to be a fact, is the average wage in Pennsylvania, we have got to go and bring Pennsylvania up. We know it is the China of the United States on wages. In order to give a working man an opportunity of contesting as a delegate to the International Congress, some provision must be made for his family. His family cannot live on the generosity of the community. That is the mistake that I think our congress has made on other things, not paying the expenses, because they have made an inducement once before to take only those who can afford it, and depriving the proletarian from representation by denying the opportunity of an existence to his loved ones at home, needing support when he is away at a congress of this kind.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): How many delegates would we be entitled to on our present membership?

A DELEGATE: Eight.

DEL. MORGAN: Eight delegates, and pay all expenses, including tips? I would like to have that information before we vote.

DEL. SIMONS: The expense is about \$300 a person.

DEL. MORGAN: Didn't you say it cost \$250 for the expenses outside of vessel money?

DEL. SIMONS: No; that was everything, including vessel money.

The question was put on the amendment by Delegate Lee, striking out "Expense" and inserting "Cost of transportation." The amendment was lost by a vote of 26 in favor and 32 opposed.

On motion, the committee's report as read was adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is a misprint in the next article. The mistake is in presenting this in any form to be changed at all. It should stand, according to the recommendation of the Committee. Article XV should stand as it is. There is no question on that. Article XVI, it is proposed to change by striking out the provision as it stands and substituting that which appears in the right hand column:

"Sec. 1. This constitution, as revised by the Congress, shall take effect sixty days after being approved by a referendum of the party membership."

The article as proposed by the committee was adopted.

The next article submitted by the committee, numbered in the committee's report as XVI, was read as follows:

ARTICLE XVI

"Woman's National Committee.

"Sec. 1. At the beginning of each odd numbered year a Woman's National Committee of seven members shall be elected from the women members of the party by referendum vote of the entire membership of the party, in a manner similar to the election of members of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner.

"Sec. 2. Such committee shall have general charge of propaganda and organization among women. All plans of such committee, concurred in by the National Executive Committee, shall be carried out at the expense of the national office."

It was moved and seconded to adopt the article.

DEL. BLOOR (Conn.): It has just been called to my attention that, as it reads, the present committee would have to go out of office before they have had a chance to report to this congress that elected them, so I would like to see some change made in the wording of that, providing that they shall report to the next national convention.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I see what the comrade is speaking of, but I think we would accomplish that if we proposed to let the committee report to the membership. For two years we have been a standing committee. Three times I have appealed to the National Executive Committee for some system or some amendment to the constitution which would enable the membership to elect our committee, but it has been put off, because of the fact that we were to report to this congress. Now, we have reported, and

the congress has elected a new committee to investigate and report on this matter again. I am opposed to Comrade Bloor's amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Comrade Bloor simply misunderstands. As the Chair will rule, it will be that the Woman's Committee elected by this congress will stand as the Woman's Committee of the Socialist Party until such time as in due order an odd numbered year comes, at which time a new Woman's Committee will be elected.

The article, as reported by the committee, was adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: Before we go further, let me return for a moment to Article XV; it is simply a matter of editing. The secretary calls my attention to the fact that the word "Congress" is omitted there. It should read: "The constitution may be amended by a national convention, national congress, or by a referendum," etc. And then: "But all amendments made by a national convention or congress," etc. If there is no objection I will insert "National Congress."

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no objection. It will be so ordered.

DEL. MAYNARD (Colo.): Before we proceed, there is a matter in regard to the election of the Woman's Committee next January. Is it the fact that this committee that was elected here yesterday has to be re-elected next January?

A DELEGATE: Yes, or another one elected.

DEL. MAYNARD: I wish that some one who moved that would move to reconsider, as I find I was ready to move this a moment ago, but I thought the Woman's Committee were opposed to it. The Woman's Committee, or most of them, are very anxious to be retained until they have had a chance to do what they can before they go out of office, and I would be glad if some one that voted "Yes" the last time would move to reconsider.

DEL. GAYLORD: Let me suggest, our party as a party is not in the habit of wiping out of office those who are doing good work. I do not believe, if those comrades who have been elected to this committee go forward with their work, that there will be any difficulty in their being entrusted with the work for the full term following. I cannot guarantee anything, but our membership are not finicky about retaining any one in office.

The next article, numbered XVII in the

Committee's report, was then read, as follows:

"ARTICLE XVII.

"International Secretaries.

"Sec. 1. Commencing the first of January in years in which an International Socialist Congress is held, the International Secretaries to which the party may be entitled shall be elected by referendum vote, in the same manner as the members of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner."

On motion the article was adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: Article XVIII brings us to this foreign-speaking proposition. A few words of introduction, I think, will help you to understand the situation. There has been a problem in our party for some years. This is a supplementary report that we wanted to take up last night. A few words of introduction, and I will try to make it short. A Lithuanian comrade came to us, asking if we took in the Lithuanian comrades. He told us that they had 2,500 members, that they are Socialists, that many of them, when they come to this country, are Socialists, that they do not understand the English language, and, of course, it is difficult to co-operate in any way with the other people who are Socialists in this country. In one town in Illinois, being the great majority there, a mining town, I believe, they have elected their own Mayor, but not on the Socialist ticket because they are not members of the Socialist party. There is a Socialist local there, I believe. He told us that they cannot co-operate, though, because of the barrier of language, and they have no means of getting together locally or otherwise. They are paying their own dues; they have their own paper; they have a national organization; they are working and carrying a card and they wear a button. They want to be entitled to be known as members of the Socialist Party of America. They want to co-operate with us, and they made us a proposition.

But, as we talked it over the comrade himself said, "I can see from your point of view that we are not quite ready and you are not quite ready yet," and in the most beautiful fashion of comradeship and with a look of disappointment on his face that hurt me, he withdrew from the conference in the sweetest spirit and said, "Well, we will wait and work a little longer." You have known that there are a good many comrades here from the foreign-speaking organizations sitting as fraternal delegates, in the congress, but not of it, and certainly something of a disturbing element, because they felt they did not have the recognition they were entitled to, and we felt it, but we did not know what to do. They sent us communications stating the things they asked, and they came in with a proposition, expecting it to be cut in two, and we could not consider their proposition, because, under the present constitution, we could not even meet them half way. Nevertheless we felt that something ought to be done, and we began thrashing the thing out between us personally. Yesterday the committee got together, and this is the result. Here are foreign-speaking comrades coming to us from other countries, speaking their own language. They can get together among themselves, but they cannot come to us and work, because the barrier of the foreign language is there. The Finns are unusually strong in their own country, unusually well trained, unusually capable of organization, and they have solved the problem by getting together in regular fashion, electing and paying their own translator, who simply has desk room in the national office. The Finns have 5,000 members now who pay their national dues, and I think, we remit half of the dues in Wisconsin to them. These comrades have been asking us to give them half of the national dues and half of the state and local dues. We said we could not speak for the state and local organization, but we began to work it out, and this is our proposition:

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE XV.

FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 1. National organizations working in languages other than English shall have the right to affiliate with the Socialist Party as herein provided.

Sec. 2. Such organizations shall number at least 500 members and shall accept and be in harmony with the constitution and platform of the Socialist Party.

Sec. 3. Such organizations shall pay a sum of five cents monthly per capita to the National Office, receiving in exchange therefor due stamps similar to those issued to English speaking organizations.

Sec. 4. Such national organizations shall have the right to elect an officer to be known as Translator-Secretary, who shall be conversant with their own and the English language, and whose duty it shall be to serve in the National Office as a medium of communication between their organization and the national organization of the Socialist Party. The wages of such Translator-Secretary shall not be more than twenty-five dollars per week and shall be paid by the National Office of the Socialist Party, the exact sum to be fixed by the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party.

Sec. 5. Each national foreign speaking organization shall be entitled to elect one fraternal delegate to national conventions or congresses of the Party, provided that such delegates shall have a voice but no vote.

Sec. 6. Members of foreign speaking organizations shall have no voice in national referendums or in the election of national officers of the Socialist Party except when they vote as members of a state organization.

Sec. 7. All political action by such organizations shall be subject to the supervision and approval of the respective state organizations, and no propaganda action shall be taken by them which is objectionable to the respective state organizations.

Sec. 8. The members of the various foreign speaking organizations shall have voice and vote in the respective local and state organizations only on such terms as may be mutually fixed by them and by the state organizations.

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

Whereas, The foreign speaking organizations are under the burden of special expense for their special propaganda; and,

Whereas, It is particularly desirable that the foreign speaking population of these states shall become an integral part of the political action of the Socialist Party of America; and,

Whereas, The state is the unit of political action in the United States; therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Congress recommend strongly to all respective state organizations that they grant charters to locals and branches of foreign speaking organizations, on conditions which shall return to the latter fifty per cent of the state and local dues; and, be it further

Resolved, That our foreign speaking comrades are reminded that the Socialist Party of America exists for the purpose of furnishing a political weapon to the working class of America; and that they are therefore under the necessity, as Socialists, of joining and co-operating with their state and local organizations.

Recommended for adoption by the Committee on Constitution:

W. R. GAYLORD, *Chairman.*
ELLA REEVE BLOOR, *Secretary.*
JAMES DE BELL.
W. P. COLLINS.
J. STITT WILSON.
GEO. H. GOEBEL.
CAROLINE LOWE.
S. M. REYNOLDS.
JOHN M. WORK.

DEL. GAYLORD: Section 4—I might explain in regard to that that if they cannot pay the salary of the man whom they elect, that is up to them; if they need such a man and the national office can afford to pay him, perhaps they can get it. That is up to the National Executive Committee.

Secretary reads Section 5.

DEL. GAYLORD: The point on that is, that if they want to vote they will go

into the state organization as our Finnish comrades have done, who have three or four delegates on this floor.

Secretary reads Section 6.

DEL. GAYLORD: That explains itself.

The secretary then read the remainder of the supplemental report of the Committee on Constitution, and after some explanation by Chairman Gaylord, it was decided to consider it section by section.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I move the adoption of Section 1.

DEL. WILLERT (Ohio): I did want to move to strike out the entire matter. If we adopt Section 1, it applies to all the other sections. I am one of those comrades who believe in getting all Socialists, no matter of what nationality, into the Socialist Party so that we can all act together instead of separately. We have in the city of Cleveland two Polish branches which are affiliated with the Socialist Party and three which are not. They are at war to-day. I believe that the foreign speaking comrades should be in with the English speaking comrades, working together for the co-operative commonwealth. I believe we can make more progress and that the foreign speaking comrades can make more progress if they are in our organization with the American comrades than they can separately. I say to them: "You are in America now; get into the American movement." I move that the whole matter relating to foreign-speaking organizations be not concurred in.

DEL. LAUKKI (Minn.): If there is trouble among the foreign-speaking organizations in Cleveland, it is because you American people don't want to help us. If you get the foreign-speaking organizations in touch with the American organization, you will save the fights and the trouble. The Finnish comrades had this trouble until we got our secretary-translator. If you have a referendum now, we have it in our Finnish locals and discuss it and debate on it and vote on it intelligently. We have three Finnish papers and each and every subject that is up for the referendum is printed in the papers weeks before the referendum. It is talked about in the locals; and we act intelligently on them as a part of the Socialist Party. Why do the foreign-speaking organizations want these separate organizations? All they ask is that they have the same rights with you; that they can have their own translator-secretary and carry on their own organization work. We have some people who are not Socialists and when an English speaking agitator comes to town they do not understand him. We have nearly all the time three Finnish agitators in the field. They are paid from these extra fees that are spoken of here. The Finnish comrades pay higher dues than the English speaking comrades. May they not maintain their organization, their translator-secretary, and pay their dues to the National Party also so that they can vote

on things that touch them? I find some of the comrades have misunderstood me. I stand for this report.

DEL. HUBSCHMITT (N. J.): While I am not a foreign-speaking representative, I think I know something about this. I was secretary of a local with twelve branches and seven different nationalities in it, and I was thrown out of a branch of the Socialist Party when I tried to explain to them the rules; we had members who didn't pay dues. We had three Polish speaking organizations, and we had a Mayday celebration where one of the dues paying organizations was not permitted to take part in the celebration. And it was all due to this complex method of purchasing dues stamps. I find from talking with the foreign-speaking comrades that the great trouble at present is that they receive no recognition from the National Organization. I think in this report there is contained the solution for most of this difficulty; not all of it; because the three paragraphs which refer to purchasing dues stamps cause a lot of trouble. I think that if they have each a secretary-translator in the National Office, that a great deal of that trouble will be eliminated and that all these referendums and other things that go to the party can go from the National Office. But, I think these provisions about purchasing stamps are not the best plan. Let them purchase the stamps from the state secretary as they do at present.

DEL. VALIMAKI (Finnish): We have been discussing this for several days between the committees and the representatives of the foreign-speaking organizations, and we have come to the conclusion that the Socialist Party has got to do something for these weak and young foreign-speaking organizations in order to help them out, in building up the Socialist movement among the men and women of their nationalities, on the same lines that we Finns have already built.

I believe, if you want to reach the foreign-speaking working men of this country, if you want to reach the eleven million workers that are toiling in the industries of this country, you must give them some rights, some official standing. You must give them a right to organize on National lines; that means that you must leave the work of organizing and educating the foreigners largely in the hands of those people who know how to reach their own class, who know the history of their people, who know the conditions under which they are living here, who know the psychology of their people. You may be

able to reach them, but not so easily and not so effectively. This comrade from Cleveland said the foreigners should come into the American Socialist movement. We foreigners all agree that this is the American movement and we want to get into the American movement; but we have to find ways and means to get in. If you just give the foreign-speaking organizations what the committee has proposed here, you just give them what we need. You have a plan by which you can get many thousand Poles into the organization; you have a plan by which you can get the Lithuanian organization into the movement; you have a plan by which you can get the Jewish workmen into the movement; these representatives here today represent millions of foreign-speaking working men. We want to make those foreigners in the first place Socialists, and when they become Socialists they know that they got to take up the fight wherever they reside. They know they have got to fight the capitalists whether they are in the United States or in Europe. And when they begin to fight the American capitalists they soon learn that they must learn English before they can fight them effectively. I ask you to adopt this report.

DEL. NOVAK (Bohemian): I speak as a member of the party for the rights of the foreign speaking members of the party. It is the impression that some of the delegates have that we are seeking to get on some of the committees. But that is not so. As it is now, we pay our dues to the locals; we buy English literature, English newspapers, and we pay the same dues as the English speaking comrade does. But, besides this we have to keep up our Bohemian daily paper; we have to keep up two weekly Bohemian papers; and we have to keep up the Bohemian organization out of our own pockets and get very little of it back. All we ask is, that we do not have to pay twice as much as the English speaking comrades do. If the comrade here who thinks we ought to be in the American movement, will remember that there are foreigners who come to this country and are here thirty to fifty years and never learn to speak the English language, he will change his mind, because that man will never become a member of an English speaking branch because he cannot speak their language. He cannot understand what they are talking about. I have come to the conclusion that the only thing to do is to organize them in affiliation with the Socialist Party in their own language; we

want to be on the same plane with our English speaking comrades; that is all.

DEL. FACKERT (N. J.): I am afraid this will complicate matters. In Hudson County we have two Italian branches, a Finnish branch and a Swedish branch. Now, if we adopt this, we are going to have trouble with these foreign branches. They will be in doubt as to which organization they ought to affiliate with. I will therefore offer as a substitute for the whole the following: "On application to the national office of five hundred or more members of the Socialist Party speaking a foreign language a translator in their language shall be employed at a cost of not more than twenty-five dollars a week." I think that will cover the matter without causing the trouble that this will.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I am a foreigner for two days of every week; because I am the editor of a foreign paper, that is, a German paper. I understand the difficulty of organizing men who do not speak the English language. I remember when the official language of the national party was German. Then it became German and English; and finally English. The only nationality that is not represented here is the German nationality. Now they absolutely fuse themselves with the American movement; and that is what you all have to do sooner or later. I am in favor of this report with one important exception. You have seven different nationalities. Now, they ask you to pay twenty-five dollars a week.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are wasting your speech, Comrade Berger; they fixed that as a limit.

DEL. BERGER: Even so; suppose you make it twenty dollars. That is the lowest you can live on in Chicago. I would not offer a translator less than twenty dollars a week in Chicago; he could not live decently. I am absolutely willing this should be done if it can be done. But it is a simple question of revenue; where will you find the money? With each nationality having five hundred members you get twenty-five dollars and you pay out over eighty dollars. If you can show me how it is to be done I am in favor of it.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I think this was the hardest proposition that this committee had to deal with. There are two sides to this question. We want these foreign-speaking Socialists to work with us hand in hand, and it is simply a problem of how to do it. We have had these foreign-speaking representatives working with our committee and we have asked

them what they want; and they have told us. An other matter: we have here a complete plan that we have figured out. Now, if you cut out any part of it you spoil the plan. Every part goes with every other part. Look at the matter of expenses; I will speak of that because it is the most important. We sat down with the foreign speaking representatives last night and we figured up how many foreign-speaking organizations might take advantage of this plan. I think we figured on a minimum basis of seven hundred members to each group on the average; and that will be very low; and we figured on a basis of seventy-five dollars a month for the translator; and we figured that if the funds came in as we believe they will that instead of being a loss to the Socialist Party of the United States, the plan will yield to the party sixty dollars a month of profit. Facts beat theories every time. The probabilities are that if it now gave us even money, in three months it would be more than even money. The Finns, I think, numbered four thousand when they came in; and they now number six thousand, and last night we were told that before the year is out they will number ten thousand. That is the way this plan will work.

Now my comrades from Paterson and from Cleveland spoke of the local troubles that they have had. We knew that they had local difficulties and because we knew that we said that our national convention should not butt into those local difficulties; and we said we better let them settle their local arrangements in those states themselves, and these foreign-speaking comrades who want to carry the red card and be members of the party, the party will show them how to do it. We will allow them to pay direct to the National Office five cents and we will have a National Translator-Secretary, and then they will know what is going on; and they will have the red card, and the red button, and can call themselves members of the National Socialist Party. If in the future they want to take part in the local or the state work, they will go to their state organizations and say, "We are not satisfied to remain outside; we want to work with you; let us get together, and see if we can't find an arrangement." The arrangement that we have suggested is this: They shall say to the foreign-speaking organizations, "All right, come in; we are glad to have you. We will give you back fifty per cent of the dues that you pay in the locals and state, in order to help you in your

political work." But if they could not agree they would still be simply members of the national party, but they would have no special rights except that they would have a translator; some one that knew their ways; that knew their language to tell them our ways and our language; that is all.

Now, in order that this plan might be clear and distinctly understood, we put in a number of articles that may be unnecessary, but they were put in, because we wanted no confusion. We say, for example, that they shall elect their national officers; but we say they shall not elect ours. Now, as a member of this committee, I know the difficulties that we are facing in this matter of the foreign-speaking organizations. I know something of them in our city of Newark, and knowing these things I feel sure that we have here the only plan yet suggested that would work. And I believe if it is adopted that in a very few months there will be other nationalities coming in with thousand and thousands of members who will add greatly to the power and influence of the Socialist movement.

DEL. GAYLORD: As Chairman of the committee I would like to introduce one who has had great experience in leading the Finns to their present position of influence. He is not a delegate, but he knows a great deal about this question. I move that Comrade Hendrickson be heard on this matter.

The motion was seconded and carried.

COMRADE HENDRICKSON: Do you say that a man has to understand English to be a Socialist? We, who have agitated among the foreigners do not think that you understand the situation. You want them to understand Socialism in the English language before they can be Socialists. Now we agitated among the Finns in the Finnish language and I ask the comrade Secretary and I ask you as members of the Socialist Party, do we ask anything from the English speaking comrades, or have we given something? We have been denied many things, but we have given to you. We gave a thousand dollars to the Red Special. And we will give you a million votes yet. I went to Wyoming when that state was wholly unorganized. Who organized that state? We Finnish people did. Who furnished the money? We did. They talk of the quarreling and the fighting among the foreign-speaking comrades. There is no fighting and quarreling among the Finns since you organized us in the Finnish language. We understand the

Finnish and we get along. We are not asking anything from the English speaking comrades. We give funds for them. We vote money for their work. But there are the Swedes and the Italians; they are not organized. The Swedes—there are a million Swedish people in the United States; where are they? In the church or in the saloon. We Finns stand for the rights of labor all over the world and that is why we are Socialists.

DEL. AALTONEN (Mich.): What we ask is the right to talk in our own language. Do we ask anything else? We like to be in the American movement. Only a little over five years ago I came to Michigan. There wasn't then, to my knowledge, a Socialist in the whole upper peninsula of Michigan. Some of the old country Finnish boys came to that country, and they organized the Finnish Socialists, and, of course, we didn't know anything about the Socialist movement in the United States, and we only knew of the movement in Finland. That was our experience. We came to Michigan and we organized the movement. When we heard that there was a party in the United States called the Socialist Party, we figured that it might be the same thing that we represented, and then we tried to find ways and means to get into the American Socialist movement—to get organized into your party. About four years ago we organized the Finnish National Socialist organization. There was something like a thousand members joined at once. After four years' experience and four years of existence we have about six thousand dues paying members in the American Socialist movement. We have six papers in America; two in Canada and four in the United States. We spend for Socialistic agitation over one hundred thousand dollars every year. We have halls all over the United States; halls for Socialist propaganda; halls for preaching the new, modern civilization; halls for our women; halls for our men; halls for our children; where we educate them in Socialism. We have in those halls over half a million dollars' worth of property. That is only a little nationality. There are not more than three hundred thousand Finns in this country. If we grow as we have in the past, it is but a short time before we have every Finn in this country a Socialist.

Now, so far as our organization is concerned, we elect the translator by a referendum. We pay him eighteen dollars a week to stay in the National office; he translates all that is necessary. We

always keep three organizers in the field, three Finnish organizers—sometimes we have had as many as seven in the field at one time, and, of course, we keep track of those organizers, and so on; keep their records, and their finances; and this is costing our organization eighteen dollars every week for the salary of this man. Of course, there is postage and those expenses. All of this means that free autonomy of the foreign-speaking organization, or the right to work in their own language, will help the spread of Socialism among the foreign speaking population of this country; it will help them to build up their own organization, so that it may be effective among their own nationality. That is the only right that those people ask. They don't want to be separate; they don't want to withdraw from the party; they want to join in the party. Here is a comrade that said there are five Polish locals in Cleveland, two in the party and three outside. Why are they outside? Because they could not come in and work in their own language? When you go to one of the Italians or Poles and talk to him in English about the party, he does not understand. This is all the privilege we ask; to conduct our work in our own tongue until we learn the American tongue.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): As a member of the committee I want to refer to one or two points in order to answer some of the comrades who seem to have a misunderstanding of this proposition. There were various conflicting propositions before the committee, presented by the various foreign-speaking representatives, and we worked hard to find some programme that would permit them to organize and do the work they wanted to do for Socialism, and by way of preface I want to say that if you accept this proposition of the committee, although I am not a prophet, I will say that within two years you will have eight or ten translator-secretaries at work in the national office representing organizations that will number from 3,000 to 12,000 members.

Now, here is something you may overlook: There is hardly a foreign language that the immigrants of that nationality don't come here by the tens and hundreds and thousands each year; they know Socialism in their own tongue; they know the economic conditions in their own country, and they know the names of the various things in their own country, but they do not know the same things here and consequently they are not able in-

telligently to ally themselves with the English speaking movement here. And in order to permit the comrades of those nationalities to join in the Socialist movement and to allow them to have their own organizations subject to the National Executive Committee, and subject to the condition under which they can join the movement in their respective states, we have devised this plan. And if we fail to do this, we allow our enemies to use these foreign-speaking workers for their own purposes and against our movement.

Now the question is asked: how about the payment of the dues? How are you going to find out who have paid their dues? Well, the substitute offered here makes worse confusion than we have now. Now the Constitution Committee have worked this matter out and they have fixed the maximum wage for the Translator-Secretary at twenty-five dollars a week, leaving the exact salary to be fixed by the National Executive Committee, based, of course, upon the amount of income that is being received from the respective organizations. Then, if the income is not sufficient, they can give them an appropriation and bring them up to that point. Comrade Gaylord has given an illustration from the Lithuanian organization, where they have actually captured a town out in this state. That organization stated it was impossible for them to pay the regular dues of Illinois, but they did say that if they could get fifty per cent back they could join the organization; and the reason for this was that they have a paper that they are supporting in their own language; but they now have an organization of 2,500 people that will come into the Socialist movement. This programme taken as a whole will allow the organization of these people everywhere, and then, if they wish to take full share in the local and state organization, it will eventually result in their joining the regular local and state organizations of the party, and will eventually result in a tremendous gain for the Socialist Party of the United States.

DEL. NASH (Minn.): A great deal of this trouble is from a misunderstanding. We have tried the plan of bringing all the comrades of all nationalities into one organization, and we have always had trouble, because, if some one wanted to make trouble he would get hold of these comrades who did not understand our language, and they were used as a factor to create trouble. And then they have organized locals by themselves. Some of the comrades say if they are

going to pay national dues where do we come in? I will tell you where we come in in Minnesota. The Finnish comrades have been organized by themselves and we had no more trouble with them. Before that, we did have some trouble, when they were organized with us. Now I will tell you where we come in. The last part of the month after the dues are paid down here in Chicago I received a check from the National Translator and it runs all the way from forty-five up to one hundred and seventy-five dollars. That is where we come in. That will answer some of the comrades who complained that the state would get nothing. Fifty per cent of the dues that they pay outside of the National dues goes to the state organization. I do not understand that there is to be any change in that. We are giving the Lettish comrades the same deal; and we are giving the Hungarians the same deal. They are becoming interested; and they are taking part in the movement. When they met with us they could not understand one word in fifty that was spoken.

I believe the method suggested here is the very best thing that can be done.

A DELEGATE: You say the dues are remitted by the Finnish Translator; what proportion of that goes to the locals in which these branches are situated?

DEL. NASH: The dues are fifteen cents; five cents goes to the National organization; five cents goes to the state organization; and five cents remains for the Finnish comrades and goes for the Finnish translator.

DEL. SKALA (Bohemian): The foreign-speaking Socialists want to see the Socialist Party of America grow and get into power. Before the Milwaukee election we sent ten thousand pieces of Bohemian literature through Milwaukee from the Bohemian branch in Milwaukee and after they won their victory we shook hands with them and congratulated them as Socialists. Now the point is, that we ought to reach these foreigners as soon as they come to this country and keep them in our organizations. There are very few delegates here, I believe, who do not agree that we must have the foreign speaking organizations. Here in Chicago are eleven locals that maintain a separate organization in the Bohemian language, and that are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Those union locals number 2,800 members; they ought to belong to us. That shows that even the labor unions recognize the necessity of having foreign-speaking organizations.

Because some of the nationalities cannot come in as individuals, they organize them on national lines. We have a great difficulty in getting the foreigners into the Socialist Party. There are immigrants that come to this country who have been reading Socialist literature in their own language, that are well acquainted with the Socialist theories, but when they come here, we are unable to reach them; and there are some Socialists who come here as immigrants, who were Socialists in the old country; and they join our organization, but we are not able to hold them in our organization. But the trouble is that a great burden has been placed upon us by the Socialist Party. Our expenses practically amount to double. We have to pay regular dues to the Socialist Party; we have to maintain our secretary; we have to hire our own speakers; publish our own papers and literature.

I hope you will vote for these resolutions.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): A point of information: whether or not the foreign-speaking organizations by paying dues direct to the National Office will under this plan have the right to vote in party affairs without being under the control of the local organization. That is the whole question at issue with me.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): That, as presented in this plan, will depend entirely upon the terms upon which the foreign-speaking organizations and the respective state organizations may agree. It will depend upon the terms mutually agreed upon between the state organizations and the foreign-speaking organizations when they fix the terms upon which they come into the state organization.

DEL. HURST (R. I.): That was a point in which I was very much interested. But there is another point: Comrade Nash has referred to the method they have had in their state. Now I contend there is no provision in this plan which would perpetuate the condition which they have enjoyed and found so satisfactory. My contention is that under this proposition the state organization would receive nothing except by some special arrangement made between the state organization and the particular foreign-speaking organization.

DEL. GAYLORD: If the state received nothing then the foreign-speaking comrades would have no voice or vote in state affairs. At the same time they would be subject to state control, as to all matters of state propaganda, which they might wish to carry on in that state.

If the state organizations received nothing from the foreign-speaking organizations it would be either because the state organization had agreed not to receive anything or because the foreign-speaking organization and its members had been given no voice or vote in the state's affairs. And under the constitution the state organization would nevertheless have control in all matters of propaganda that the foreign-speaking organizations might wish to carry on in the state.

I think you will find this programme pretty well put together as a whole.

DEL. HURST: Then, as I understand it, if in the future the Minnesota comrades decline to have further arrangements with these organizations, then the checks will stop coming from Chicago.

DEL. GAYLORD: Delegate Nash now has an arrangement by which that amount is returned to the state secretary. Now, if it should be determined that it should be returned to the local secretaries, or the branch secretaries, that will be the arrangement. But it must be satisfactory to the state organization, and the foreign-speaking organizations. They have an arrangement with them. If they want to change it they can.

DEL. HURST: I submit then that this will eliminate that revenue.

DEL. GAYLORD: Do you so understand it, Comrade Nash?

DEL. NASH: I do not. Neither do the Finnish comrades. We have no expectation that there will be any change. We have the same with the Hungarians, and the same with the Lettish, and the same with the Polish. I do not think any of them will ask to have it changed.

DEL. HURST: "Section 3: Such organizations shall pay a sum of five cents monthly per capita to the National office, receiving in exchange therefor due stamps similar to those issued to English speaking organizations."

Does that go to the state secretary?

DEL. GAYLORD: If they are not members of the state organization that goes to the translator direct; and the foreign-speaking organization has no connection whatever with the state organization.

DEL. HURST: That is an option open to them at all times?

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes.

DEL. HURST: Then I submit that they may proceed at once to eliminate the state organization irrespective of Comrade Nash or anybody else; and proceed to pay the five cents to the National Office. The Socialist Party of that state

will have nothing to do with them so far as the money is concerned; but if they choose to make terms with the state organization it will be on such terms as are mutually agreeable; and unless they make such terms they have no voice or vote—we concede that—but they have the option whether they make terms with the state or not? That is the proposition?

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes; but the state can control their propaganda and prevent them carrying on their work of that kind if it wishes. It means that if they don't make terms they must still be unobjectionable to the state organization. Do you see, comrade??

DEL. HURST: I see that; but there is another point. It seems to me that even with that understanding it would create confusion. There would not be the same smooth working that there would be under this substitute, which provides that there must be five hundred members paying their dues through the state secretary in the ordinary manner. And if our foreign-speaking comrades are as well qualified as I believe they are; and up in Rhode Island, they are among the best qualified members we have—I am not trying to throw anything in the way of the foreign-speaking comrades—as I say, they are the best we have there; but I do believe that this substitute would remove friction.

DEL. GAYLORD: What is your proposition, Comrade Hurst?

DEL. HURST: I claim that if they paid their dues to the state secretary in the regular way, and have the National office furnish them with this translator, that they could go on with the propaganda as they have shown themselves well able to do in the past, and that a much greater benefit would come to the party than under the committee's proposition.

NATIONAL SECRETARY BARNES: I feel that this is the most important question that has come before this congress. In 1904, the National Convention deliberated on this for about four hours and then referred it to the National Committee. The National Committee, shortly following that time, gave it consideration; and the National Executive Committee since that time has given it consideration, at least on nine separate occasions; but we have never defined a policy. I have my doubts about the workings of the present proposal, but I will say this for it: If it is to be tried it should be tried in its entirety; just as it is. There are certain proportions maintained throughout the plan, one section being arranged

with due regard to the other sections, and it makes a complete proposition. So I believe there should be no division; and no amendment to it. It stands as a whole. However, it does not present a complete relief from the difficulties presented by the foreign-speaking organizations, the principal one of which is their release from the extra burden placed upon them in their present relations with the local party organizations.

The point is this: The Finnish comrades pay their regular party dues in their respective localities, or the state dues in their respective states, and over and above that they pay a certain amount to their national organization. The same thing is true of the Polish and a number of other organizations. Now, that is a burden from which they are seeking relief. This proposition, if they maintain their present status, does not give them that relief. But on the other hand, this arrangement will give them a translator, but the individual member pays exactly the amount he does to-day. He will pay more than you and I English speaking comrades pay. Now, if the foreign comrades understand that and accept it, it is all right. But there is nothing in this that warrants Comrade Nash in expecting the continuation of his present arrangement; that is a matter between his state and the various foreign organizations; that may be maintained if they are willing. We hope that it will be. But, if the comrades are looking for release from the higher dues that they pay, I question whether it is not an inducement for them to take the open National door and forget their local attachments. Of course, I see the point made by Comrade Gaylord, that then they lose certain rights that they otherwise would have in the state and local organizations. But it has been the higher dues that kept the Lithuanian comrades, that have been mentioned, out of our organization.

I hope, if adopted, this will be adopted in its entirety so that it can be tried out, and experience will then show whether it is feasible or not.

Here is another point: the Polish comrades and the Bohemian and several others have endeavored to establish in the past two years with the state organizations, the same relations regarding dues and the same financial terms as have been mutually agreed upon by the states with the Finnish organization. The Finnish Translator sends on the 26th, 27th or 28th of each month a complete report to the state secretaries of the states in which

the Finnish locals are found, and this report recites the number of locals that pay dues to the National Finnish Translator in every state, and the proportion of that amount that belongs to the National organization the translator pays into the National Office. The amount that belongs to the state he sends in the form of a check. Now the Polish and other organizations have tried to enter into the same arrangement with the state secretaries, and the state secretaries have in every instance refused for the reason that they would have to wait before making up their own financial report until they had received a report from five or six or more translators of each of the different nationalities. And the state organizations, wherever this has been broached, have refused to adopt this plan. I believe that we should give every encouragement to these foreign speaking comrades, and these foreign speaking organizations; and this plan may be tried. If you are in doubt after the discussion, then adopt the substitute, which, after all, secures the main thing, that of establishing a translator for each organization.

DEL. BERGER: Do you favor this?

SECRETARY BARNES: I am willing to give it a trial, unless there is further objection developed.

DEL. WILLERT (Ohio): It is no spirit of antagonism that has brought up this issue. Plainly stating the facts, as Comrade Barnes has stated them, this question is of vital importance. It is our object to bring into the Socialist movement the working class, no matter of what nationality, and drill them in discipline, drill them in Socialism. I may not understand the fundamental philosophy of Socialism, but I do understand organization. I have been in the labor world for twenty-eight years and I believe I know something of organization. In this plan, all I can see is the dividing of the working class. I did not say that we wanted the foreign-speaking comrades to come into the American branches. I said I wanted them to come into the American Party, the American movement. We want you to have branches of your own; but we want you to send delegates to the central bodies so that we can take up these various questions and discuss them, and know where we are at. In the City of Cleveland your Finns are not connected with the National Translator's office. They are in Local Cleveland and one of the best branches we have. That is where they belong. We are talking about buying dues stamps from the

National Office. Who is going to give these various branches or organizations the right to violate Section 4, of Article XII? The state organizations will determine that. You cannot stop us selling dues stamps to any other organization. Don't forget that. I would like to see that changed; I would like to see the national party predominant in this country; and because we don't have that condition, we have so much of this trouble.

It is not a question of dues at all. The dues question does not come into it with the Finnish comrades of Cleveland. They pay their regular dues to Local Cleveland, and besides that they pay extra dues. They support the Finnish papers; they give entertainments; they held an entertainment a month ago that netted \$200. We don't say that they shall come into the local branches; but we do want them to be connected with the central body; we want one grand organization. And I hope the time will soon come when we become one grand army of the working class and do away with state autonomy. We must consolidate the whole movement throughout the United States.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): I want to state briefly that in Massachusetts we have twenty-one Finnish clubs that work under the present arrangement. It works excellently. I am of the opinion that while the proposition as the committee has submitted it, carries with it an element of danger—the danger of creating national units in the state—I am also of the opinion that something must be done in this matter and this is the only concrete proposition that we have had before us. We have got to begin somewhere and learn. If we make a mistake; if it is found to harass the state organizations, or is found to be embarrassing financially or to build up national units within the state, then that can be brought to the attention of the party and the mistake rectified. But something should be done promptly and so I shall vote for the proposition as submitted by the committee with the full knowledge that some danger may arise. It will not arise, because of our Finnish organization, because they are for the organization, men and women, and they never bolt, or split, or threaten. They do their work according to the decisions of the organization. But some of the other organizations have a tendency to build up a sort of distinct organization. But with all these dangers, I suggest to the delegates that they should vote for this proposition,

situation in Regard to Foreign-Speaking Organizations was then adopted.

A motion to suspend the rules having been adopted, Delegate Lee moved, seconded by several delegates, that the report of the Committee on Resolutions follow immediately after the conclusion of the discussion of the report of the Committee on Constitution. Carried.

Adjourned until May 21, 1910, 9 A. M.

SEVENTH DAY'S SESSION.

The congress was called to order at nine o'clock by Secretary Roewer.

Delegate Gaylord of Wisconsin was elected Chairman of the day.

REPORT ON CONSTITUTION.

Consideration of the report of the Committee on Constitution was resumed, Delegate Goebel taking charge of the report on behalf of the committee.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): In regard to the last article in the printed form that you have before you, there is a

little doubt as to the exact number, owing to the insertion of the article in regard to foreign-speaking organizations. The article reads:

"All amendments shall take effect sixty days after being approved by the membership."

On motion the article was adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now ready for the minority reports on the constitution. There is one that Comrade Lowe will present. Comrade Lowe is recognized for the minority.

MINORITY REPORT ON CONSTITUTION.

We, the minority of the Committee on Constitution dissenting from the report of the majority as to the provisions in Section 1, Article VI of the Constitution, recommend that said Section 1, Article VI be amended to read as follows:

"The National Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members, one to be chosen from each one of the following geographical districts of the United States by a National Referendum of the Party membership issued to the Locals of the Party in such districts by the National Secretary. The call for nominations shall be issued to the locals in said districts by the National Secretary on the first day of October in years of uneven numbers; each Local shall be entitled to nominate seven candidates. Thirty days shall be allowed for nomination, fifteen for acceptances and declinations and fifty for the referendum. Nominations from five Locals shall entitle a candidate to be placed on the ballot. The candidate in each of said districts receiving the highest vote shall be elected. Vacancies shall be filled by the National Committee from membership within the district where such vacancies occur. Members of the Executive Committee may be recalled by a referendum vote in the manner provided for referendums in Article XI hereof, except that in such cases the initiative shall not be held open for thirty days but shall be sent out immediately."

DISTRICT I.

Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York.

DISTRICT II.

Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio.

DISTRICT III.

North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee.

DISTRICT IV.

Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Texas.

DISTRICT V.

Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa.

DISTRICT VI.

North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, New Mexico.

DISTRICT VII.

Washington, Idaho, Oregon, California, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska. Respectfully submitted by the Minority Committee on the Constitution.

(Signed) JAS. A. DE BELL, Mass.
CAROLINE A. LOWE, Kansas.
JOHN M. WORK, Iowa.
S. M. REYNOLDS, Ind.

our stand, and we feel sadly the need of more enlightenment upon this subject.

Just as some of our arguments upon this question must have appeared pitifully ridiculous to those who really understand it, just so did some of the discussions upon the problems of our comrades upon the farms of Kansas and Oklahoma appear pitifully ignorant to those of us who represent these sections.

They spoke contemptuously of the owning farmer of Oklahoma and Texas. They did not know that they were speaking of that which is almost a myth. The owning farmer in these states has scarcely an existence.

Comrades, you do not understand. Could you but live in their wretched cabins, toil with them from daylight until dark—their wives and babies sacrificed in the cotton fields of the South—could you but see the eagerness with which they grasp our message—when they ask for bread you would not give them a stone.

Why should not a comrade residing in the South, understanding their lives and problems, represent them upon the National Executive Committee?

I must take this opportunity to make my position clear upon the subject under discussion yesterday. A misunderstanding arose upon the farmers' program of Oklahoma. I must call your attention to its opening and closing sentences.

"As measures calculated to bring into collective property the land, and enable the farmer to have the use and occupancy of the land sufficient for a home and the support of his family, we hereby advocate and pledge our elected officers to the following program."

"Land now in the possession of the

What is the result? The result is a great loss to our national movement because of the fact that the interests of the various sections of the country are not understood.

It was almost the unanimous decision of this conference that we could not vote intelligently upon the immigration Committee because we are not

sufficiently familiar with the main facts on this important question.

To those of us living away from the coast and its vicinity, the immigration problem means very little. We are not faced day after day with perplexing questions that we must answer upon this subject. Because we do not come into contact with it and because we do not come into more close contact with our comrades who must face it, we are left in ignorance of it. But when we find many of our best informed, our most devoted comrades standing firmly for the exclusion of certain races, we are forced to a realization of the fact that a great national issue is at stake. A national issue upon which we as Socialists must take

state or hereafter acquired through purchase, reclamation or tax sales to be rented to landless farmers under the supervision of the Board of Agriculture at the prevailing rate of share rent or its equivalent. The payment of such rent to cease as soon as the total amount of rent paid is equal to the value of the land, and the tenant thereby acquires for himself and his children the right of occupancy. The title to all such lands remaining with the commonwealth."

My work is in Kansas. But for six months, day after day, I have met with our comrades upon the farms of Oklahoma. Never once did I dodge the issue. Always, unequivocally, have I stood firm upon the plank in our national platform for collective ownership of all land used for the purpose of exploitation. Had I but once attempted to deny this principle, the Socialist farmers of Oklahoma would have arisen in indignation and denounced such a statement. The Socialist farmers of Oklahoma and Kansas realize that the man who controls the crop owns the crop, and that the man who owns the crop owns the farm. They are demanding the ownership of the crops—the full product of their labor—and will be content with nothing less. The farmers' program is but the attempted first step in the accomplishment of this end.

I find it is our comrades of the city who have not come into contact with the farmer who are fearful of him. You think of him as a land-owning laborer—employing class. He is a tenant serf, enslaved with his wife and children, bound hand and foot by the money lender and land owner.

Because the Socialism in an agricultural state must of necessity be an agricultural movement, just so the Socialist program in an agricultural state must be an agricultural program.

And this, the first step to formulate such a program, has been brought before you, as I understand, not for your sanction as an official document of the Socialist Party of America, but for your earnest consideration and advice. To recommend a question so little understood was the wise and just course to pursue.

How can we come to an understanding of the problem not only of the Southern cotton belt, but the Northern wheat belt, the mining problem of the

Rockies, the labor problem of the Pacific, the factory problems of the East?

By electing on our National Executive Committee men and women who are familiar with these problems, because they are a part of their every day life, they can then deliberate intelligently upon the national problems, and the result of these deliberations will produce benefit to each section.

Not that there is the slightest feeling against our National Committee individual comrades. You have the love and the respect and confidence of the rank and file throughout every section of the country. Why? Because to a greater or lesser extent they know that you are writers, speakers through the press and on the platform; you come to them and they learn from you. You have a hearing before them. Do they have a hearing before you? The Farmers' Committee composed of, as we supposed, our best informed men upon this subject, submitted before us that to their surprise they had discovered an obscure comrade whose book knowledge of the subject was as broad as theirs and whose practical knowledge, because day after day he must meet the problems of the farmer, was even greater. There was no hesitancy upon their part in regard to receiving the experience of the hitherto unknown comrade. Eagerly they accepted his wisdom and gave him place upon their committee.

You say that to divide our United States into districts will give more room to sectional prejudices. Today we have sectional prejudices because we are isolated within our sections. Race prejudice disappears as races intermingle. The national prejudices disappear as nations, by means of the press, telegraph, telephone, are brought more closely together; sectional prejudices will disappear as the comrades from all sections become familiar with the industrial problem in all sections.

To me it does not mean that by this means we will lose the invaluable service of the Hillquits, the Bergers, the Hunters. It does mean that the men and women of keen intellect, or broad understanding, earnest devotion, from every part of this country, are given greater opportunity to serve us in our efforts to inaugurate the co-operative commonwealth. I do not ask you to vote for the minority report. I do not say that I shall vote for the minority report. If it can be proved to me that

by its adoption we shall have done that which is not to the best interest of the Socialist movement of the United States, then I shall vote against it.

What we do ask is an earnest discussion, free from impassioned prejudice, a discussion that has ever uppermost the intimate welfare of the greatest cause this world has ever known.

DEL. CORY (Wash.): I move that the minority report be substituted for the majority. (Seconded.)

On motion of Delegate Jacobsen of Iowa the previous question was ordered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the minority ready to speak? Comrade Lowe is not ready, being slightly ill. Will Comrade Reynolds represent her?

DEL. REYNOLDS (Ind.): Comrade Lowe has made a pretty good argument in behalf of the minority report. This question as it presents itself to the Socialist Party is of vastly greater importance, perhaps, than those who have moved the previous question can conceive at this time. I was myself a member of the executive committee for three or four years. I join with Comrade Lowe in saying that I have nothing but the kindest feelings toward the Executive Committee. I do object to the fact, without reference to the method through which that fact exists, that a large portion of the Executive Committee comes from one city, and almost from one state, which militates against the equitable consideration of questions that are presented to the Executive Committee, not by the membership, not by parts and portions of the United States, but by the Executive Committee themselves. I should think that the Executive Committee, desiring the advancement of Socialism, would themselves favor this minority report. They are themselves at a loss many times to know those questions that are presented here in a congress. No man can know how the Socialists of the Pacific Slope feel, unless he comes from that section, on the immigration of the orientals. No man can know how the southern comrades feel, nor how the industrial center comrades feel, nor how the farming sections feel, unless he has been in touch with them. Therefore it is that this minority report presents an opportunity to bring together members of the Executive Committee, who may formulate plans

and propaganda for the Socialist Party, that will be useful instead of otherwise. Now, our Executive Committee today is composed largely of writers—brilliant writers, it may be; I have no criticism to pass here at this congress upon their writings. But they are subject to the laws of economic determinism, and we as Socialists should be willing to put limitations upon the inherited tendencies we have to exploit our own ideas, and to exploit, perhaps, our own books and our own literature upon the movement. I know that in one or two instances it was not possible for me to get some propaganda matter published by the national organization which should have been published. Leaflets that should have been published will come up here in the Resolution Committee. The leaflets on propaganda in the army and navy, for example, have not been issued by the national office that should have been, years ago, enlightening the working class who are forced by economic conditions into the ranks of the so-called butchers of the world. We know there are excellent men under arms, and we recognize the latent comradeship that is in their hearts. I brought this question myself before the Executive Committee. I presented it here on the floor of this congress in a private way, not in public. I never was on the floor of the congress before to speak, and never asked for it. I presented that propaganda proposition, and it was turned down in the committee.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): Will you yield to a question?

DEL. REYNOLDS: Sure.

DEL. CAREY: Will the delegate please state whether it was the Executive Committee that was elected by the recent referendum that he brought this matter before?

DEL. REYNOLDS: This present committee.

DEL. CAREY: This present existing Executive Committee?

DEL. REYNOLDS: All of them.

DEL. CAREY: Do you mean to say that I as a member of the committee—that you presented the matter to me?

DEL. REYNOLDS: No, I presented it to the national office. The National Secretary was requested to present it to the National Executive Committee. That propaganda is very important, and I believe that if we had

had in the past the geographical representation idea we would have had considered all these questions, the farm question, the immigration question, propaganda among the army and navy, and those other questions. The objection may be made that this proposition militates against state autonomy. Comrades, state autonomy is one of the relics of the past. It has, or will have some time, no significance in the Socialist movement. When we all become Socialists ultimately, state boundary lines and geographical districts will not be essential to the tactical work of the party. The domination of local ideas, local pride, local politics and local interests militate against the solidarity of the Socialist Party. In this proposition of the minority report no such thing can occur, and the state autonomists will not be interfered with tactically. No one is bound to take part in the referendum if he does not see fit. The local secretaries may send names into the national office, and if they do not or if that state does not, then that state fails to participate in the selection of a geographical representative upon the Executive Committee.

I take it that the presentation of the minority report is in accord with the fundamental principles of Socialism; and I think the majority report is not. I think that the minority report leads towards democracy in the movement instead of autocracy in the movement, and that it will bring peace and harmony, larger intelligence, more kindness, more sympathy, more co-operation and less friction. It is one of the important things that this congress should adopt. If they do adopt it I know the result will be good. I know that the rank and file are yearning not for leadership, but for enlightenment and intelligence, and that they will welcome it and overwhelmingly approve the acts of this congress.

(Delegate Thompson was called to the Chair.)

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): Do I understand that the debate is closed?

DEL. GAYYLORD (Wis.): The debate is closed. On behalf of the majority of the committee I wish to say a few words in closing the debate. This is not a matter of state autonomy; quite the contrary. Indeed, it is against state autonomy. I was chairman of the Committee on Constitution at the last national convention,

and as a member of that committee, I tried to secure and did secure, so far as the referendum was concerned, the election of the National Executive Committee by the national committee, which is the most representative body of the party outside of conventions and congresses. But that was destroyed by the preferential election proposition, and we are brought now to the point where we were in the convention two years ago, to have the National Executive Committee elected by a referendum of the party. I want to say that my opinion still holds good, but this proposition coming up in this form is a most preposterous thing. Now, I want to say a word concerning Comrade Lowe. She is one of the most sincere, honest, earnest and capable comrades that I know. Her only disadvantage in this matter is that her work so far has been confined to the particular district where she lives and where she knows the people intimately. What is wanted is a committee capable of working on broad lines and taking in the country as a whole. I do not know whether you understand the full nature of this proposition that is before you. I want to tell you what this means as it stands. There are seven districts, the first being Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut and New York. It constitutes 18.5 per cent of the dues paying membership, as shown by the dues paid for the first four months of 1910, and it includes 17 per cent of the population of the country.

District number 2 is Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia and Ohio. It has 20 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 21 per cent of the population.

District 3 is composed of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Kentucky and Tennessee, with 1.5 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 15.7 per cent of the population.

District 4 is Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri and Texas, containing 8.6 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 13.5 per cent of the population of the country.

District 5 is Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Iowa, with 25.3 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 20 per cent of the population of the country.

District 6 is North Dakota, South

Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming and New Mexico, with 16 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 7.8 per cent of the population.

District 7 is Washington, Idaho, Oregon, California, Utah, Nevada, Arizona and Alaska, with 10 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 4.5 per cent of the population of the country.

Socialism is supposed to be scientific, and the organization of the party should be based upon facts. Now, which line of facts shown here are you going to follow? If I had a map here I could show you that as to geographical districts, the proposition certainly is not scientific. As to population it does not tally. As to dues-paying membership it is preposterous. What is it that they want? I cannot understand. If I were to go more closely into this thing I could show you other objections. The industrially organized and developed parts of the world, as we understand it today, are those parts in which Socialism naturally develops first; not the agricultural portions, the most backward agricultural sections. Yet, here is a proposition to give two small populations and two small districts and two small dues-paying memberships, constituting the most backward, industrially and agriculturally, sections of the country, two representatives upon the National Executive Committee. Somebody explained that this must have been done while they were asleep.

Now, the National Executive Committee is an executive committee—an executive committee, please note. Now, an executive committee is not a legislative committee; it is an administrative committee. It is called upon to act quickly, and to act quickly it is necessary to have the members within a convenient distance and not have to wait for members thousands of miles away. Now, what is the complaint that is made? It is that these distant sections are not represented upon the committee. I have shown you the reason. These sections are backward in their development; they are backward industrially; they are backward agriculturally, these two southern sections especially, and industrially others are not as advanced as these. What harm to the party has come from the present plan? Has there been any division

of the movement, or has the movement gone forward unitedly under the present method of administration. That is a question that has to be answered. The party is not divided; the party has not suffered under this method.

A roll call was then ordered on the adoption of the minority report, resulting in 31 in favor, 45 opposed, and 34 absent or not voting, and the minority report was declared lost.

The chairman stated that there was an opportunity to present motions from the floor, and that a motion to adopt as a whole would be in order.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I move that the report be adopted as recommended in full. (Seconded.)

DEL. O'NEIL (Wyo.): I move to amend Section 3 of Article XII by adding the words: "That only excessive filing fees and legal restrictions will excuse the leaving of blanks on any ballot where there are enough dues paying members to fill the ticket."

The amendment was adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now ready for the question on the adoption of the report as a whole.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): Does the Chair rule that you would entertain amendments, but such amendments must be in writing?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Del. Merrick then offered the following amendment to take the place of the first sentence in Sec. 1 of Art. VI:

"The National Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members from the membership of the party, and they shall hold office for two years; provided, not more than one member can come from one state."

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now going to vote on adopting that as a part of the constitution.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I want to know whether that paragraph that was read previous to the last was adopted.

THE SECRETARY: It was adopted.

DEL. THOMPSON: I move to reconsider. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: Sure; it was not discussed at all. There was not a word said about it.

The motion to reconsider was put and declared lost. A division being called for, the vote resulted 42 in favor of reconsideration and 27 against.

A point of order was made that a two-thirds vote was required to re-

consider, but the point was not sustained, and the matter was reconsidered, being Del. O'Neil's amendment.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): The amendment, as I understand, proposes to force every local to put a full ticket in the field. With but one or two positions to be filled there would probably be no difficulty. But suppose there are fifteen judicial positions to be filled and but ten members, you can see it is ridiculous to say that our locals shall fill the tickets when there are not enough members. Furthermore, suppose they have members enough, but they could not take a place on the ticket because they would lose their jobs. It illustrates the fact that we have not given this proper consideration when we place articles in the constitution in that way. It is unnecessary in Wisconsin, and I believe the whole Wisconsin movement is as clear and as uncompromising and stands as much against fusion and compromise as any body of Socialists anywhere in the United States, and we are just as intelligent as anybody. We ought to leave the matter to the state or local, and if there is any fusion or confusion in any city let the state take care of it.

DEL. BERGER: I am going to leave in ten minutes. There is some labor trouble in Milwaukee, and the unions have asked me to come home. I wish to say that I think the party has gone on long enough on the old system, and well enough, so that we do not have to change. Take our situation in Milwaukee last year. We did not have lawyers enough, even that middle class party that is made up of trade unionists and other members, to fill the positions of seven city judges to be elected and the judge of the Supreme Court. Now, the judges that are elected in Milwaukee, we want them to be good, because they have to be in office five years. We had at our disposal two men, and one of those lawyers was the secretary of the Brewers' Union, the last job he took. We took those two men, and we were compelled to leave five places on the ticket empty in order to be good Socialists. This is a useless and foolish proposition. Leave it to the state. There is no foundation for suspicion or foundation for danger of fusion. In Germany they are not afraid of fusion. In France they are not afraid of fusion. But in America, especially down in

Mississippi and Georgia and Louisiana, we are continually warned against fusion. Comrades, leave the constitution as it is. It provides against any kind of fusion, treason or other affiliation of our party.

DEL. O'NEIL (Wyo.): Every state in the Union has different laws regarding its primary ballots and conventions. A great many states have laws which make restrictions with regard to ballots. In those cases this amendment would allow them that privilege of keeping members off who were not capable of running for office. In our state we can nominate any laborer and run him for the Supreme Court of the state if we want to. Suppose he could not qualify after election, you see the situation.

DEL. THOMPSON: The same as we are in Milwaukee, because we can elect them.

DEL. O'NEIL: As I understand Comrade Berger's argument, the present constitution and local regulations cover it. As far as we are concerned, we had fusion in the biggest county in our state. Of course, the rules of our party forbid fusion, nor was such a thing ever contemplated, but in spite of this they nominated a legislative ticket and had an understanding with the Democrats and left a blank on the legislative ticket. That is the condition we have to deal with. There is nothing in our constitution to protect against it. What we want is something that will stop fusion. These men will come to the members of the party and tell them that they are doing these things in other states. Now, the members have no opportunity to go and hunt up the information and find out the legal restrictions or obstructions that there are to putting a ticket in the field. They will simply accept the word of these men because of ignorance of the facts, and we are simply losing members from the party in the state. We want the comrades of the United States as a party to help us. We don't ask for restrictions to keep them off. I submit that the argument against this amendment was an argument in favor of it. All we want is something that will protect us. If you read the constitution you will find that there is nothing in it that will cope with this situation. I came to this congress to try and protect our state organizations. All we want is help.

The previous question was then ordered.

The amendment having been again read, the question was put on the adoption of the amendment, and the amendment was declared lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is now on the adoption or rejection of the committee's report as a whole.

The question was then put, and the report as a whole was declared adopted. Del. Morgan of Illinois requested that he be recorded as voting no.

On motion of Del. Goebel (N. J.), the rules were suspended in order to permit the Committee on Resolutions to report at this time, so far as the committee was prepared to report.

On motion of Delegate Hoogerhyde of Michigan, the telegram received from Local Grand Rapids at the banquet on Tuesday evening was ordered printed in the proceedings.

The telegram was as follows:
Grand Rapids, Mich., May 17, 1910.

J. Mahlon Barnes,
National Socialist Congress,
King's Restaurant,
Fifth Ave., between Washington and
Madison Sts., Chicago, Ill.

Local in session sends greetings. One working class political party, one industrial union, both thoroughly revolutionary, spells early victory over capitalism. Let us hew to that line.

JNO. VANHORF, Sec'y.
8:32 P. M.

DEL. LEE, for the Committee on Resolutions: This is the only subject upon which there was not a unanimous report. Upon this subject there is a minority and a majority report, proposed respectively by two and seven members of the committee.

The majority recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

ATTITUDE OF THE PARTY TOWARD LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

REPORT OF THE MAJORITY.

Resolved, That this national convention of 1910 reaffirms the attitude of the Socialist Party toward the labor-union movement as declared by the national convention of 1908, in brief as follows:

1. That the party has neither the right nor the desire to interfere in any controversies which may exist within the labor-union movement over questions of form of organization or methods of action in the industrial struggle, but trusts to the labor organizations themselves to solve these questions and to evolve in the direction of ever closer solidarity and even more effective action on the industrial field.

2. That it is the interest and the duty of the party to give moral and material support to the labor organizations in all their defensive or aggressive struggles against capitalist oppression and exploitation, for the protection and extension of the rights of the wage-workers and the betterment of their material and social condition.

The National Executive Committee is hereby instructed to cause the "Address to Organized Labor" as adopted by the convention of 1908 to be edited in so far as to bring up to date the references to specific events contained therein, and then cause it to be reprinted as a leaflet and use all proper means to give it the widest circulation among the organized working people of the United States.

ALGERNON LEE, New York, Chairman
JOSEPH E. COHEN, Pennsylvania
ADOLPH GERMER, Illinois
W. B. KILLINGBECK, New Jersey
JASPER M'LEVY, Connecticut
ELIZABETH H. THOMAS, Wisconsin
JOHN G. WILLERT, Ohio

REPORT OF THE MINORITY.

Delegate Cannon of Oregon, for the minority, offered the following:
Whereas, The movement of organized labor is the natural result of the

antagonism between the interests of employers and wage-workers under the capitalist system, and is a factor to be considered in the propaganda of Socialism, it being an important as well as so often the first step in the development of class consciousness; therefore, be it

Resolved, by this congress in session assembled, That we recommend the organization of labor along industrial lines based on the recognition of the irrepressible class conflict in society, but we do not oppose labor in any form of organization in its struggle against the capitalist class while evolving along class lines to economic and political action whereby in time it will demonstrate by such intelligent action its solidarity and internationally making for its final emancipation and overthrow of wage slavery.

E. L. CANNON, Oregon
W. H. WAYNICK, Washington

Delegate Cassidy (N. Y.), seconded by Delegate Maurer (Pa.), moved the adoption of the following substitute:

CASSIDY SUBSTITUTE.

Whereas, The last International Socialist and Labor Congress, held at Stuttgart, in 1907, adopted a resolution proclaiming that—

"To emancipate the proletariat completely from the bonds of intellectual, political and economic serfdom, the political and economic struggle are alike necessary."

In other words, that such complete emancipation of the proletariat is impossible unless it is organized both economically and politically for that purpose; and

Whereas, The above Stuttgart resolution further declares that—

"The development of the capitalist system of production, the increased concentration of the means of production, the growing alliances of employers, the increasing dependence of particular trades upon the totality of bourgeois society would reduce trades unions to impotence if concerning themselves about nothing more than trade interests, they took their stand on corporate (craft) selfishness and admitted the theory of harmony of interests between labor and capital;" and,

Whereas, In conformity with this resolution the Socialist Parties in practically all European countries stand decidedly on the side of and go hand in hand with true, class struggle unions and not with unions ignoring or destroying the class struggle; and,

Whereas, The above quoted description of important trades unions exactly fits the American Federation of Labor as it stands at present, and explains its impotence as a body not only to emancipate the working class but even to effectively protect the workers un-

der the capitalist system; and,

Whereas, Industrial Unionism, standing on the principle of class struggle, aiming to protect the workers in the shops now, and to finally secure their complete emancipation, and guided by the spirit of solidarity of workers not only of one craft, but of entire industries and of the whole working-class of America and the world, is alone able to effectively cope with the advanced conditions of American capitalism, and corresponds with the character of labor unions insisted on in the Stuttgart resolution as indispensable for the emancipation of the working class; and,

Whereas, The Socialist Party cannot be either indifferent or neutral on this momentous question without condemning itself to impotence to attain its final goal, and without betrayal of the cause of emancipation of the working class from wage-slavery; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Socialist Party, standing in the future as in the past, ready to assist the workers engaged in a struggle to improve their conditions, no matter how they are organized or whether they are organized at all, endorses Industrial Unionism as a principle and as an indispensable part of the class struggle, without endorsing any particular organization; and be it also

Resolved, That we declare it to be the duty of our agitators and of the publishers of our papers and our literature to teach our members and friends the principles of Industrial Unionism to enable them not only to make propaganda for our party and general principles of Socialism among their fellow members of whatever union, craft or otherwise they may belong to, but also to carry to them the message of common action against common enemy and of Industrial Unionism generally,

and thus hasten the day when our party, in its struggle with the Beast of Capitalism, will not stand any more as at present with its back unprotected or outflanked by the outposts of the Civic Federation, but will, like our sister parties in Europe, be backed by a powerful revolutionary army of Industrially organized workers, unconquerable and victorious.

DEL. CASSIDY: There has been a great deal of time wasted in what I think was a search for problems; but this problem which is of vital moment to the Socialist Party has been silently ignored.

I am of that school of Socialists who believe that industrial democracy, or the co-operative commonwealth, can never be ushered in until we have an economic organization that will back up the ballots that we cast. But from the personnel of the congress as I have sized it up, I have little hope for the adoption of this substitute which I have offered, because I take it that this congress is not a proper representation of the workers of the United States. The people who have most largely occupied the time of this congress are not working men or working women, that have come here from the working class. You will find they are doctors, and lawyers, and ex-preachers, and people of that character, who are now assuming the leadership of the working class of this country, until the working class themselves find out just what the class struggle is. In this substitute we are not asking you to endorse the I. W. W., but if you are to assume the role of the savior of the working class; if you assume to lead the working class in organizing on the political field, why in the name of God and of common sense don't you tell them to organize upon the economic field? That is the question. You are trying to evade the issue. You are trying to evade the issue so as not to offend the American Federation of Labor. I am not asking you to endorse the I. W. W. What I am asking you to endorse is industrial unionism.

You have heard a lot of talk about the Stuttgart resolutions. I want to tell you that the salient points in this resolution that I have offered are taken from this document printed in three languages at the Stuttgart congress in 1907. So it seems we American Socialists are not paying

much attention to our international congresses.

Now there were comrades here who said that we ought to read up a little. I think it would have come with a great deal better grace if those comrades had not made those remarks, because I want to tell you there are a whole lot of workingmen who work twelve and fourteen hours a day who have no time for reading books. But I tell you they don't have to read books to know that there is a class struggle. They can get Socialism out of the hard facts. I learned Socialism through the hard school of experience, and I did not need Marx, or Engels, or Bebel or Liebknecht, to tell me where my material interests lie.

Let us meet this issue as Socialists; let us face it as men. Let us tell the workers of this country that they are following a false light. Look at the Federation of Labor. It is made up of two hundred crafts scattered through forty-five states, three territories, and the District of Columbia. Suppose a foreign invader landed in Boston Harbor; and the rest of the country allowed Massachusetts to fight the enemy single handed. You would say that was a hell of a Union. That is the identical position in which the labor unions of this country are today. And we, the Socialist Party, are asking the workers to participate in this sickly piece of sentimentality, this sickly burlesque. Go out like men and tell them to organize industrially, in a grand organization where everybody will stand for all the rest, one for all and all for one, and when one strikes all strike. That is my motto.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I do not believe there is a comrade here who does not believe absolutely, irreconcilably and irrevocably in a complete, most compact, most solidified organization of labor, both in the economic and the political fields. But how are we to get those things? That is the practical, the only question before us. What does the majority report say? That our party has neither the right nor the desire to interfere in any controversy which may exist within the labor union movement over the question of the form of the movement—

(Here a request was made that the majority report be read, which was accordingly done.)

Now, the question is this, shall we

accomplish more by letting this fight be fought out in the ranks of organized labor by the men who are making the fight there, or shall we accomplish more by passing resolutions outside of the ranks of the unions and announcing theories of the proper form of labor organization? The trial has been made many times to accomplish the result we all want from outside the ranks of organized labor unions. We tried it once; what was the result? We did not organize the unions, but we split the Socialist Party. Some other well meaning comrades started the I. W. W. Did you organize the trade union movement, into your line of action? No. You split the I. W. W. into two sections; and you did not help the Socialist Party. I say to you here and now that the industrial labor form of organization is an advanced stage, and the best form of labor organization. Let me give you an example of what this means if you adopt it. We go back to Philadelphia. We have a building trades council that is organized as an industry; and is not organized on the lines of craft autonomy at all. They do not recognize contracts. A strike of one is a strike of all. It is organized on industrial lines. It believes in political action. It believes in united political action. For what? For the Republican Party. Do you want us to go back to Philadelphia and say that that is the form of industrial unionism that we want? We who are fighting the class struggle in the trades union movement; we who are fighting for the principles of international solidarity, who are fighting inside the trades unions and who are slowly, through mistakes, perhaps, developing that condition of solidarity, we ask you to adopt the majority report and let those of us who are fighting the class struggle inside the trades unions fight this battle out for ourselves.

There is another point in this. There have been some severe remarks made here about Sam Gompers, and it is made to appear that the rank and file of the American Federation stand for the principles of Sam Gompers and stand for the Civic Federation. I deny those statements in toto. If it is true that the American Federation stands for Sam Gompers why is it that Sam Gompers was unable to deliver the vote of organized labor for William Jennings Bryan in 1908? If it is true

that the rank and file of the American Federation of Labor are the same as their officers, and that those officers express their principles, then every one who is a member of the American Federation ought to be expelled, because I am satisfied every one of you here is opposed to the Civic Federation. I ask you not to adopt these other resolutions, which only mean the injection from the outside of something that does not belong here. It will only give the reactionaries in the trades union momevent whom we are fighting inside the trades union movement another lease of life, make martyrs of them, and hold back for a long time our endeavor to organize the trades unions along the lines of revolutionary Socialist principles.

DEL. BARNES (Louisiana): I am not speaking alone for the I. W. W., but I am speaking for ten millions of black people. The solution of that great race problem lies in the organization of the colored race industrially, which is the only organization they can comprehend. I have been a member of the Federation of Labor and also of the Carpenters' Union. We have tried in every way we could to organize those people into some form of union, but the only form that we have found effective in organizing them is the industrial form. And in speaking of those ten million of people I want the comrades to understand that we have there the greatest wage problem that there is in any section of the United States. It is greater than your problem in the east or your problem in the west; a thousand times greater. And if there are any solutions of that problem that you can suggest it is up to you to suggest them; it is your duty to suggest them. I don't believe the I. W. W. wants this congress to endorse it. It simply wants you to recognize the principle of industrial organization. The cause of Socialism demands that we shall adopt the industrial form of organization because that is the form that reaches down and gets the man lowest down; and we have got to get the man that is lowest down or the capitalists will use him to defeat us and defeat his own interests. Now whether it is right or wrong the white people of the south won't mix with the negroes. Men go down there for a few months and try to understand the condition of things. I have lived among those people

forty-five years and new things come up every day. But after living in both sections, and standing impartial on this question, I believe that the industrial organization is the only solution of this tremendous problem. You cannot organize the negroes politically in the south; it would do you no good if you did. They disfranchise him. But this industrial movement will educate him; and when the white Socialists get into power, he will come in as an educated man to do his part, and will become a valuable citizen. That is why I am in favor of the industrial form of organization.

DEL. M'ALLISTER (Mo.): You say the colored man is disfranchised. Some of the comrades deny that. Will you explain that?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, no. We can't go into that. Some one to speak for the substitute next.

DEL. SCHNAIDT (Ohio): We believe that this substitute is the fairest thing presented here. Why? We who are in the American Federation of Labor and yet believe in the industrial form of organization, are there why? Because in our particular districts there are no means by which we can stand for industrial unionism as there are no such organizations. Therefore we join the American Federation of Labor hoping to accomplish more by doing so than we can accomplish outside. But we are opposed to trade autonomy because, for one reason, it has been demonstrated a thousand times that one trade will work while the other strikes. We know that is wrong and we simply want you to adopt the substitute and say just what we think is right and what we ought to stand for. The mover and author of this substitute is not a member of the I. W. W.; he belongs to the American Federation of Labor; he does not want anything to do with the I. W. W. Neither do I. I belong to a craft that recognizes American Federation of Labor. We would gladly get out of it if we possibly could. We are in a position where we cannot. But give us a chance to express ourselves in favor of the industrial form of organization. We are not asking for the indorsement of the I. W. W. We are not asking for the indorsement of the American Federation; neither are we asking for the domination of the American Federation of Labor. We simply ask for an indorsement of the principles of industrial unionism.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): I am one of the originators of the I. W. W. I am not one of the intellectuals who has never been down in the dust, and who does not know the real condition of the working class. I hoped that when this question of industrial unionism came before the Socialist congress, it would come in such a form that the Socialist Party could endorse the principle of industrial unionism without seeming to indorse any particular organization; but now, when the substitute comes, it places me in a position where I cannot accept it, because in it there is a clause which practically condemns the American Federation of Labor. If that were not in it, I would endorse the substitute. But with that clause in it, I am compelled, although in favor of industrial unionism, to vote for the majority report. If you leave that clause in there and adopt it you place the Socialist Party in the most undesirable position it could possibly be in. The cry is raised all over the country now that there is danger of a labor union party. Think if that happened what a position you would be in if you adopted that resolution; if you said to the unionists in the American Federation that you would rather endorse the industrial form than the American Federation of Labor. What we must recognize in studying social tendencies is that the constant growth of centralization among the big corporations, the steady growth and efficiency of trusts, makes it absolutely necessary that the working men shall adopt another form of organization on the industrial field than that which for a time was very effective. The craft organization of the working class is not sufficient as a weapon to combat the widespread army of capitalistic combination and centralization, but neither is the mere industrial organization. Now there is no industrial organization in the country today that has gone clearly on record as favoring political action. When we organized the I. W. W. we hoped that it would be both a political and an economic organization, uniting on the industrial and the political field in the most efficient manner. Instead of that, from the very outset there crept in an element that made for disintegration, and today the I. W. W. has drifted back towards syndicalism. They say that

they are not for political action until the whole working class is organized industrially, and that then out of that industrial organization will come political expression. We say the political and industrial organization must now act together. And now, when the I. W. W. is in the stage of disintegration, when it is fighting the Socialist Party instead of helping it, I shall take good care not to indorse that sort of thing. Let them show that they are actually organizing the working class; let them work with Western Federation of Miners; let them work with the Socialist Party and not try to disrupt it, and then I shall have no fear of declaring plainly and positively for the industrial form of labor organization, but until then I refuse to vote for this substitute and shall vote for the majority report.

The Chairman having announced that he would recognize as far as possible speakers for the various propositions before the house in rotation, Delegate Thomas appealed from the ruling of the chair on the ground that it was not fair to the supporters of the majority report who were in the majority on the floor. On a division the ruling of the chair was sustained, by a vote of 33 to 15.

DEL. BURKE (N. H.): It looks as though a labor union party is soon to be formed; but whether it is or not it seems inevitable that there will soon be a new party in this country. That new party will probably stand for the public ownership of certain public utilities, and it will stand for various reforms and immediate demands, with a certain progressive element that is now trying to conduct the Socialist Party. When that time comes the radical elements of this country will flock to this new party. Then the Socialist Party will have to go back to the bed rock principles of international Socialism and will have to stand squarely for the class struggle.

Now I stand for the minority report because I recognize the fact that capitalism cannot be abolished without a class struggle in the economic organization. I live in the paper town of Franklin, New Hampshire. We had a strike there this spring; and it was still on when I left home. The union paper makers affiliated with the A. F. of L. were out on strike. The paper trust imported scabs and strike breakers. These men were housed in the mills; they had their food brought

to them in the mills; the militia were called out and all the usual tactics were used by the capitalistic class to break that strike, and yet the railroad employees affiliated with the A. F. of L. did not refuse to haul the paper made by the scabs, the union printers did not refuse to use the paper made by the scabs, and yet all these unions were affiliated with the A. F. of L. I am a member of the A. F. of L. But I am a member of necessity. I want to get out of it. I want this Socialist Party to take a stand for the economic organization along right lines. I don't ask for an indorsement of the I. W. W. I do want a plain statement so that our speakers can point out the proper lines of action both politically and economically. The minority report does not denounce the A. F. of L. But it does stand for the principles of industrial unionism.

DEL. MAURER (Pa.): I have been in the union movement for thirty years. I have also been a delegate to many state conventions of the American Federation of Labor, as well as to every Socialist convention in that state. I have never up to this time voted along the lines of this majority report. I wish now to explain the reasons why I favor the substitute. The Socialist Party is, of course, not a trades union movement. But the trades unionists and the unorganized workers do—and there is no doubt about it—they do look to the Socialist Party for information on these various subjects that pertain to their very existence. It is also true that we are qualified to inform them. Now this question is not brought here by the American Federation of Labor. The American Federation of Labor has no representative here. Nor do I understand that the I. W. W. has any representative here asking us to indorse them. As I understand it, the position of the supporters of both the minority and the substitute report is that they should simply advise the working classes where we think they belong. Now, I have not found in my experience of the past two years a single progressive Socialist who is opposed to the industrial form of organization. I do not believe there are five Socialists in this congress who will deny that the industrial form of organization is the best. Now there must be a reason for the difference of opinion here, and it is this: we have not yet arrived at

that stage that we are willing to back an unpopular idea. I do not care what the American Federation of Labor thinks about my stand here. We all know that craft unionism has outlived its usefulness. There was a time when the capitalists stood as individuals; and then the craft union was all right as a weapon with which the workingmen might defend himself; but now those individual capitalists are concentrated in great combinations with one great central office, one body of executive officers, and the weapon which was all right before is becoming useless now; and when there is a strike of one craft, unless they all stand together, they are doomed to defeat, because they are beaten by other crafts. Now we Socialists are practically agreed that this is a bad thing; then why do we not stand up and tell the truth? I say we owe a duty to the working class world and we are not performing it. There is no one has less use for the I. W. W. than I have. One would think that it was a fight here between the I. W. W. and the A. F. of L. But it is not that. The substitute does not call for that. It simply tells this Socialist congress to advise the workers of the world what is the stand they should take on the economic field. They do not recommend them to join the I. W. W. I am a member of the American Federation of Labor and have been for thirty years affiliated with the craft unions. If the American Federation of Labor has ceased to be of use to the laboring classes, then it is proper that we should condemn it. I tell you the boys of the American Federation are looking for a better form of organization. Most of them are like me, they would like to be out of it, but they have to have their card so that they may support the wife and the babies. I must keep working and I can't work without my card. So I ask this congress to point the way to the true solution, the industrial organization of labor on the economic field, and vote for this substitute, which is the statement of the honest opinion of nearly every delegate here.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): I believe all the comrades who have spoken for the majority, the minority and the substitute reports. We as delegates to this congress want to do the very best we can for the Socialist Party as a political organization. But sometimes with the very best intentions we do

make mistakes and fall into traps. We do not realize the position, until we have done something that we hardly understand ourselves. What do you suppose would be the attitude of Sam Gompers and the Civic Federation on this proposition? They would manifestly be pleased, if we would adopt this substitute; and they would be pleased for this reason: while the substitute resolution states that they would not endorse any particular political organization, friends, you know better. If we adopt the substitute and indorse the industrial form of organization as there stated, is it not equivalent to indorsing the I. W. W? Nobody knows that better than the I. W. W. men who hope to disrupt the Socialist Party, men who are members of Socialist locals and do nothing else but try to disrupt those locals and get the members for the I. W. W. I do not believe, mind you, that those who have supported the minority and substitute reports here have any such motive; I do not believe that is true. What do we gain for the workers by adopting the minority report or the substitute? Would the industrial form of organization immediately gain great power? Decidedly not. Would it change the condition of the men who are now in the A. F. of L? Decidedly not. Would it help those in that organization—that organization who favor the industrial form of labor organization? Decidedly not. But it would do this, comrades; it would put those who are now in the Federation of Labor in such a position that they could not say a word about politics in that organization, because they would throw them out, and say they were there for the I. W. W. and opposed to the Federation.

DEL. THOMPSON: That is the danger.

DEL. PREVEY: That is what I want to guard against. You remember that we are now making a special propaganda movement among the unions. Comrade John Collins, who is a machinist with a union card, is going among the unions and doing good work for the Socialist Party. Do you suppose that these national organizers are going to be allowed to go into those unions and get the floor if you adopt this minority report or the substitute? As Socialists we must get a hearing. We must be heard. We are a political party; we should leave the economic organizations to

fight out their own battle, and work out their own problems; and if our philosophy is true, then there can be but one outcome of that fight. You have heard here today that many thousands and hundreds of thousands are helpless unless they join their craft unions; they have nowhere else to go. If that is so, then we must reach them by getting them within the area of our political propaganda. I say the trades unionists know their own immediate business best. I am sorry that so many Socialists know—or think they do—all about what the trades unionists should do. I was in that position for a number of years, until I had a discussion with the editor of our labor paper. I found that the trades unionist knew a lot more than I did about what he wanted, and about the conditions in his particular unions.

Now, friends, we are all agreed as students of political economy that the industrial form of organization is the best. Members of the A. F. of L. have stated that fact on this floor. The question is the attitude of the Socialist Party as a political party at this time. I say that if we adopt the minority report or the substitute, we practically shut ourselves out of the American Federation of Labor and indorse the I. W. W. And by the way, referring to that telegram sent to the Socialists at Newcastle, Pennsylvania, nobody knows better than the Socialists here from Pennsylvania that the Socialists of Newcastle had to repudiate the I. W. W.

When I returned from the last convention of the Socialist Party, I was glad to be able to read to the trades unionists of Akron what the convention had said on the trades union question. I want to be able to do it again, because we want to get those men; and we want to get the men of the I. W. W. and the men of the A. F. of L. and the unorganized workers. So don't let us make any mistake. I was opposed to indorsing the suffrage association, I am opposed to indorsing the I. W. W. I shall vote for the majority report.

DEL. KOCHANOWICZ (Polish Sec.): I am against the majority report because the first section contradicts the second. I say it is the duty of this Socialist Party to show to the workingmen what is their duty on this question. We should say that the craft system is a bad one and the industrial system is the right one. In the first

section we read that this party has neither the right nor the desire to interfere. I would say that we do not want to interfere in any fight that may exist within the labor union movement; but we have a duty to perform in letting them see which is the right form of organization. The whole American Federation of Labor is based upon an idea of organization which was all right in the eighteenth century, but is useless in the twentieth. If we, as students of economic conditions, are agreed that the industrial form is scientific and correct, is it not our duty to point out to the workingmen the true way they should go in their fight? I do not see why we should not express our mind, express our convictions in our resolutions. I am against the majority report because it is not what we want as Socialists. I am for the minority report because it states what we want as Socialists.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I am merely a soap box agitator. When I go upon the platform I say that labor is entitled to its full product. That is the Socialist doctrine. The A. F. of L. says it is only entitled to a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. Capitalism has developed so that competition has been eliminated practically among the men who own the tools of production. Then what is the use of craft unionism trying to get anything out of the industries of the country today which are nationally and internationally controlled? This question came up two years ago and we didn't have sand enough to take hold of it then. I hope we will now. The American Federation of Labor is going into politics. And when that time comes Sam Gompers will refuse to allow us the platforms to tell the union men that we demand for every man the full product of his labor and not a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

What is the ultimate aim of the American Federation of Labor? I don't see any. During all this time while capitalism has been concentrating and eliminating competition among capitalists, what has the American Federation of Labor been doing? I have not seen a single progressive step. You claim to have a lot of Socialists in the American Federation of Labor. Two years ago Gompers peddled the votes—or tried to—of the members of the American Federation of Labor to the back doors of the Republican

and Democratic parties. And right after that the American Federation of Labor with its Socialists voted unanimously to make him president again; and I believe the National Secretary of this organization voted for him. You say you want to develop inside the American Federation of Labor. Have you ever pointed your finger inside the American Federation of Labor and asked why they wanted a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, when they ought to have all they produce—have you ever done that? If you have done that you have reorganized the American Federation of Labor. It is under the control of the Civic Federation fakers. It surely is, Comrade Cassidy. Comrade Cassidy said that he was willing to withdraw the clause that Comrade Untermann objected to. That does not materially strengthen the argument for the substitute. But I am tired of being told by the National Organization not to hit the American Federation of Labor. I refuse much longer to keep my hands off the American Federation of Labor that says a fair day's pay is all right. That says the wage system is all right.

A DELEGATE: What is your trade.

DEL. FURMAN: I am a dentist.

DEL. SEIDEL (Wis.): Did you ever go into a meeting of the American Federation of Labor and tell them as a Socialist that a fair day's pay was sufficient for a fair day's work?

DEL. FURMAN: I never did. I never told them that they should be satisfied with anything but the full product of their labor. We have been told here what a beautiful demonstration of solidarity they had in Philadelphia. What took place? The rank and file wanted to go on strike and the officials would not let them until the rank and file said: You get to hell out of this, and they went on strike, and the unorganized men went with them. The American Federation of Labor workmen furnished the power at the power house to run the cars for the scabs that were running them. That is the kind of organization the American Federation of Labor is. You tell me to keep my hands off them when I get up on the street corner and I am pretty near the point where I refuse to do it. Try to develop this party without a spine and you will drive the Socialists out of this movement.

A DELEGATE: Go back to the S. L. P.

DEL. FURMAN: I will never go back to the S. L. P.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Cassidy states that he is willing to strike out the clause in his resolution objected to by Comrade Untermann.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I object, Mr. Chairman. At this hour, when many of the delegates have expressed their convictions of this matter, and it has developed that there is a strong opposition to this substitute, I must object to any modification of the wording of any of the three motions before the house.

The Chairman declared the point well taken and declined to allow the modification.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): In favor of the majority report let me say this. We are not cowards; we are not afraid to take a position. But, comrades, we must be careful builders. We are in the presence of enemies who are shrewd and unfair and adroit. They are tacticians, they are parliamentarians, and some of them are absolutely unprincipled and immoral. In the presence of such an enemy we must be careful. Now it has occurred to me that if we would do a little more thinking on some of these problems and a little less talking, we might get a little closer to the solution of our difficulties. Just for a moment run over in your mind the history of the Socialist movement in America for the past twenty years. In this minority report and in the substitute you are asked to take a step that has twice resulted disastrously in the history of the Socialist movement in America. The S. L. P. tried it and it absolutely killed the S. L. P., then the only expression of the working class in the political field. Then again the same kind of a mistake was precipitated in the I. W. W. movement. Now, I don't want to say a word against the sincerity or the honesty of those comrades who launched that movement. But it seems plain that there again a similar mistake was made. But steadily through all these years our party has maintained another attitude. It has been the attitude expressed in the majority report. That attitude has been what has placed the Socialist Party of America in the splendid position it occupies today. Let me say this: that that attitude persistently and consistently ad-

hered to has won to us in Milwaukee ninety per cent of the trades union vote. You can't win the trades union vote by passing one resolution. It takes years of steady work. Most of these union men have got to be shown. They have been told that the Socialist Party is against the trades unions. And it took a lot of persistent hard work to convince them with the men working against us in that movement that we were with them. We don't want to make any mistake about this matter. Let me remind you of another thing. The situation in European countries is very different from what it is here. The substitute quotes from the Stuttgart resolution and then tries to apply that resolution to this country. But the conditions are entirely different here. In Europe the trades union movement and the Socialist movement are practically one and the same. What we want to do here is to stand by the policies that in Milwaukee have made the relations between the trades unions and the international Socialist movement one of harmony and unity. We have done that in Milwaukee and we believe we have done it on the basis of the majority report. If you will follow that policy whole heartedly, honestly, patiently year after year, you will before long place the national movement where the movement in Milwaukee now is, so that there will be no question if there is a Socialist ticket in the field as to whether a trades unionist should vote that ticket, and every trades unionist will call that his ticket.

I am opposed to the minority report and the substitute for another reason. In Milwaukee we have had a difference of opinion in the trades union movement. We could not take sides with one side or the other. Why not do what we did in Milwaukee in this matter and say: This is the Socialist Party; we do not propose as a party to interfere in your controversies. Let them settle that in their own field; and let the Socialist Party take care of its own controversies. And it will have enough to do if it does that.

Now, I believe it is true that as a principle every intelligent member of the Socialist Party realizes that the industrial form of organization is the real form of organization that we want. But, comrades, do not forget that every Socialist in the American Federation of Labor is struggling in that or-

ganization for the industrial form of organization. You don't need to tell me to do that. We don't need to resolve to do that. Just do it. As a matter of fact we are doing it. I am a trades unionist. I was going to pull out my card to show you. But we are working; and steadily, but surely, irresistibly, the truth is gaining ground in the trades unions. If you leave us the policy that we have followed so successfully for the last five or six years, we will win the trades union movement; we will solidify it; we will bring its members into the Socialist Party; and the Socialist Party of America will go straight on to victory.

DEL. WAYNICK (Wash.): During this discussion I have been wondering what you propose to do with the vast army of workingmen who are not organized. You can't handle them very well unless they are organized.

Now, at our last convention in Washington we adopted a resolution in favor of industrial unionism, but not opposed to political action. We expressly stated that; and no one need object to that. I think that in the matter of the trade union movement Washington will measure up pretty well with all other parts of the country. I live in a town where there are something like thirty different trade unions. They did not make any objection to that. And if you will notice in this minority report there is no endorsement of anything, or any organization. It merely commends the industrial form of organization. I think, in fact, this minority report removes the objection that Comrade Untermann had to the substitute. I want to call your attention to the fact that since the Knights of Labor there has been no real effort to organize the great mass of unorganized labor. The Knights of Labor made an effort to do it and at one time I thought they would succeed. Right there I want to ask every trades unionist here what effort they have made to organize the great mass of unorganized working men? I know that there is nothing being done in that line in the state of Washington. You are not trying to organize the great mass of workers in the lumber industry there, or in the canneries. Perhaps it is impossible to organize this great unorganized mass. I want to call your attention again to the fact that we merely rec-

ommend the organization of the workers along the industrial line. And it seems to me that is the only way we will ever get this great unorganized mass which we must have as well as the trades unions.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): Most of the speakers who have supported the majority report say: We are against the American Federation of Labor, but don't let's tell anybody about it. Keep it quiet, or they will find it out. Every speaker says he favors the industrial form of organization; and they have said that the I. W. W. was an industrial organization. It was never intended to be an industrial organization. Those who defended it and worked for it knew nothing of industrial organization. That has been proven a failure. We are told by the majority report that we who have been working for the industrial form of organization—that we were mere theorists. All the theories I ever got on this subject I got from practice. I have been in labor unions; I have been in the councils of the labor organizations; and what I have seen there impels me to work for industrial organization. We are told by the comrades from Milwaukee that they have access to the unions of the A. F. of L. Perhaps they have; and then we are told by the Milwaukee comrades that they are opposing the heads of that organization. It is not many years ago that Victor L. Berger in the name of the Socialists got up in the Federation of Labor and supported the nomination of Gompers for the presidency of that organization. Do you approve of the conduct of Berger in that convention? I for one won't stand for Berger or anyone else supporting the nomination of Gompers, in the name of the Socialists of the United States.

A DELEGATE: State the circumstances.

DEL. CANNON: It was pretended that he was in danger of being sent to jail and that he ought to have united support. I want to point out the fact that since that time whenever there is an election, the United States Courts make a martyr out of Gompers—conveniently make a martyr out of Gompers—and they elect him again. At the last convention we were told that he would probably be called to Washington to go to jail before the convention closed.

And I suppose after a lot of delays

he will again be threatened with jail just about the time when the convention of the Federation is held again. They are martyrs in order to continue them in office.

Bear in mind that I stand with the Federation of Labor so far as the rank and file are concerned. I stand with the strikers in Philadelphia, with the unorganized strikers in Bethlehem; but I do not stand for the policy of that organization as carried out by its officers. President Taft is a member of the Federation of Labor. Ex-President Roosevelt is a member or was. I don't want any of it in mine.

Let us see what will be the effect of this substitute. You are afraid of offending the great mass of workers in the Federation of Labor. You can't offend them by being radical or even ultra radical. In the brass and silver workers' organization there are forty crafts united; that is industrial unionism; the men themselves are coming to it; but you are afraid of it; afraid to speak your minds on it.

It is said that Gompers would like to have you adopt this substitute. Don't be afraid of that. Gompers is going to have his hands full.

I want to tell you again that the great mass of the American working people are ready for action, for concerted political action. We who are in the advance of the progressive labor movement have been working on that for years and our labor is not lost. The work of the soap boxers has not been lost. The energy is gaining all the time; it is being stored up and when the crisis comes it will sweep capitalism out of power. If you want to be with us then you must be with us now.

Now, comrades, for years when I have been on the soap box and I have been asked what is the position of the Socialist Party on the trades union and industrial union question I have had to apologize for it.

Here the other day Comrade Hunter said that he was surprised that after we had appointed these great intellectual men on committees that we should reject their work. He said the soap boxer came here and repudiated the work of these highly intellectual men. I want to tell you why: because the soap boxer on the street corner, in the hall, advocates the same kind of Socialism all the time.

Delegate Carey rose to the point of

order that by action of the congress it was determined to take a vote at 12:30. The chairman pointed out that reporters are entitled by the rules to fifteen minutes.

Delegate Goebel stated his motion stated a fixed hour for the vote.

Delegate Branstetter moved a reconsideration of the motion by which the time was fixed at 12:30. The motion to reconsider was lost on division.

The previous question was then moved and seconded and on a division was carried by 54 ayes, and 20 noes.

The secretary then proceeded to call the roll of delegates upon the question of the adoption of the substitute offered by Delegate Cassidy. The substitute was lost by a vote of 58 noes to 23 ayes.

ROLL CALL.

Alabama—No: C. G. Hutchisson.
Arizona—Yes: Jos. D. Cannon.

Arkansas—Absent: Stanley J. Clark.
California—No: W. Carpenter, J. Stitt Wilson, Ernest Untermann, John H. Wilde. Absent: J. B. Osborne.

Colorado—No: W. P. Collins, Mila T. Maynard.

Connecticut—No: Ella Reeve Bloor, Jasper McLevy.

Florida—No: C. C. Allen.
Idaho—Yes: T. J. Coonrod.

Illinois—Yes: T. J. Morgan. No: G. T. Fraenckel, Mrs. Simons, A. M. Lewis, G. A. Peterson, A. M. Simons. Absent: Robert Giese, A. W. Nelson.

Indiana—Yes: S. M. Reynolds. Absent: Jas. O'Neill.

Iowa—No: John M. Work, J. J. Jacobsen.

Kansas—No: Kate Richards O'Hare. Absent: Geo. D. Brewer. Not voting: Caroline A. Lowe.

Kentucky—Absent: Walter Lanfersiek.

Louisiana—Yes: J. W. Barnes.
Maine—Yes: Grace V. Silver.

Maryland—Absent: W. M. Coleman.
Massachusetts—No: James A. DeBell, James F. Carey, Harriet D'Orsay, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr.; Dan A. White. Absent: Marion Craig Wentworth.

Michigan—Yes: J. Hoogerhyde. No: Frank Aaltonen. Absent: Henry Kummerfeld.

Minnesota—Yes: Leo Laukki, Mrs. Esther Laukki. No: J. E. Nash. Absent: Morris Kaplan.

Missouri—Yes: W. W. McAllister. Absent: E. T. Behrens, W. L. Garver.

Montana—No: Geo. W. McDermott.
Nebraska—Absent: Clyde J. Wright.
Nevada—No: W. H. Burton.
New Hampshire—Yes: John P. Bassett.

New Jersey—Yes: Frank Hubschmitt. No: Max Fackert, Geo. H. Goebel, W. B. Killingbeck.

New Mexico—Absent: C. B. Lane.

New York—Yes: C. L. Furman, Frank Cassidy. No: Jos. Wanhope, Algernon Lee, W. W. Passage, P. Dills, Gustave Strelbel. Absent: Morris Hillquit, H. Schefer.

North Dakota—Absent: Arthur Bassett.

Ohio—Yes: E. L. Schnaadt. No: E. E. Adel, W. H. Miller, Marguerite Prevey, John G. Willert, L. A. Zitt.

Oklahoma—No: Oscar Ameringer, Winnie E. Branstetter, J. T. Cumbie, G. W. Davis.

Oregon—Yes: Tom J. Lewis. No: E. L. Cannon.

Pennsylvania—Yes: Edward Moore, Jas. H. Maurer. No: Jos. E. Cohen, Fred H. Merrick, Wm. Adams. Absent: Thos. F. Kennedy, Robert B. Ringler.

Rhode Island—No: Fred Hurst.
South Dakota—Not voting: E. Francis Atwood.

Tennessee—Yes: T. H. Haines.
Texas—Yes: W. J. Bell, W. W. Buchanan, P. G. Zimmerman.

Utah—Absent: W. Thurston Brown.
Washington—No: Mrs. E. D. Cory, W. H. Waynick.

West Virginia—Absent: Harold W. Houston.

Wisconsin—No: Victor L. Berger, W. R. Gaylord, Emil Siedel, Carl D. Thompson.

Wyoming—No: W. L. O'Neil, John Heckala.

Wyoming—No: W. L. O'Neil, John Heckala.

Delaware—No: J. Frank Smith.
Georgia—Absent: Paul Hochscheid.

Mississippi—Absent: S. W. Rose.
North Carolina—No: Rufus J. Morton.

South Carolina—Absent: A. J. Royal.
Virginia—Yes: E. B. Slatton.
Summary: Yeas, 23; nays, 59; absent, 25; not voting, 2.

The secretary then called the roll upon the question of adopting the minority report.

ROLL CALL.

Alabama—No: C. G. Hutchisson.
Arizona—Yes: Jos. D. Cannon.

MORNING SESSION, MAY 21, 1910

Arkansas—Absent: Stanley J. Clark.
California—No: W. Carpenter, J. Stitt Wilson, Ernest Untermann, John H. Wilde. Absent: J. B. Osborne.

Colorado—No: W. P. Collins, Mila T. Maynard.

Connecticut—No: Ella Reeve Bloor, Jasper McLevy.

Florida—No: C. C. Allen.

Idaho—Yes: T. J. Coonrod.

Illinois—Yes: T. J. Morgan, G. A. Peterson. No: G. T. Fraenckel, Mrs. Simons, A. M. Lewis, A. M. Simons.

Absent: Robert Giese, A. W. Nelson.
Indiana—Yes: S. M. Reynolds. Absent: Jas. O'Neill.

Iowa—No: John M. Work, J. J. Jacobsen.

Kansas—No: Caroline A. Lowe, Kate Richards O'Hare. Absent: Geo. D. Brewer.

Kentucky—Absent: Walter Lanfersiek.

Louisiana—Yes: J. W. Barnes.

Maine—Yes: Grace V. Silver.

Maryland—Absent: W. M. Coleman.

Massachusetts—No: James A. DeBell, James F. Carey, Harriet D'Orsay, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr., Dan A. White.

Absent: Marion Craig Wentworth.

Michigan—Yes: Frank Aaltonen, J. Hoogerhyde. Absent: Henry Kummerfeld.

Minnesota—Yes: Leo Laukki, Mrs. Esther Laukki. No: J. E. Nash. Absent: Morris Kaplan.

Missouri—No: W. W. McAllister. Absent: E. T. Behrens, W. L. Garver.

Montana—No: Geo. W. McDermott.

Nebraska—Absent: Clyde J. Wright.
Nevada—Yes: W. H. Burton.

New Hampshire—Yes: John P. Burke.

New Jersey—Yes: Geo. H. Goebel, Frank Hubschmitt. No: Max Fackert, W. B. Killingbeck.

New Mexico—Absent: C. B. Lane.

New York—Yes: C. L. Furman, Frank Cassidy. No: Jos. Wanhope, Algernon Lee, W. W. Passage, P. Dills, Gustave Strelbel. Absent: Morris Hillquit, H. Schefer.

North Dakota—Absent: Arthur Bassett.

Ohio—No: E. E. Adel, W. H. Miller, E. L. Schnaadt, Marguerite Prevey, John G. Willert, L. A. Zitt.

Oklahoma—No: Oscar Ameringer, Winnie E. Branstetter, J. T. Cumbie, Absent: G. W. Davis.

Oregon—Yes: E. L. Cannon, Tom J. Lewis.

Pennsylvania—Yes: Fred H. Merrick, Edward Moore, Jas. H. Maurer. No: Jos. E. Cohen, Wm. Adams. Absent: Thos. F. Kennedy, Robert B. Ringler.

Rhode Island—No: Fred Hurst.

South Dakota—No: E. Francis Atwood.

Tennessee—Yes: T. H. Haines.

Texas—Yes: W. J. Bell, W. W. Buchanan, P. G. Zimmerman.

Utah—Absent: W. Thurston Brown.

Washington—Yes: Mrs. E. D. Cory, W. H. Waynick.

West Virginia—Absent: Harold W. Houston.

Wisconsin—No: E. H. Thomas, W. R. Gaylord, Emil Siedel, Carl D. Thompson.

Wyoming—No: W. L. O'Neil, John Heckala.

Delaware—No: J. Frank Smith.

Georgia—Absent: Paul Hochscheid.

Mississippi—Absent: S. W. Rose.

North Carolina—No: Rufus J. Morton.

South Carolina—Absent: A. J. Royal.

Virginia—Yes: E. B. Slatton.

Summary: Yeas, 29; nays, 54; absent, 26.

The vote showed 54 noes and 29 ayes. The minority report was defeated.

Delegate Goebel moved that when the convention adjourned it adjourn for one hour. Carried.

The majority report was then adopted.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I want my vote recorded as voting against this majority report.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I want to go on record as voting for it.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): I want to go on record as voting No on the majority report.

Adjourned until 1:30 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Gaylord called the congress to order at 1:45 P. M.

On motion the minutes of the ses-

sion of Friday were approved, subject to correction as to attendance of individual members.

IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): I wish to make a motion that the Immigration Committee be continued by this congress. This was omitted at the conclusion of the report. I move that the Immigration Committee be continued by the congress, to make special expert scientific investigation of the whole problem of immigration in general and Asiatic immigration in particular. The reports of this committee ought to be printed as a source of information for the party, national and international.

The motion was seconded.

DEL. T. J. LEWIS (Ore.): The motion did not state when this report was to be published. I think it would be well to publish it at some specified time, at least before the next convention.

DEL. WILSON: Let me state that I have another resolution to come, that their reports shall be published at least three months before the convening of the next convention.

The motion was carried.

GOVERNMENT BY COMMISSION.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business before the house is the

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR CITIES

I. EXTENT OF.

At least twelve different states have already passed laws authorizing their cities to inaugurate the Commission Form of Government. These states are: Texas, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota, Massachusetts, California, Idaho, Tennessee, Mississippi and Oregon. The total number of cities thus far having adopted some form of commission government, number at least seventy-five.

A steady agitation is being carried on through the magazines and various capitalistic sources for the extension of the system. It is evident, therefore, that this form of municipal government is destined to be quite widely applied.

II. FEATURES OF THE COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

There is a great variation in the different laws pertaining to commission form of government. However, a casual study of the various state laws and the forms contained show the following characteristic features:

1. Non-partisan nominations and elections.
2. Elections at large eliminating ward representation.
3. Majority elections, provisions that allow only two contesting nominations for each office in the final election, thus compelling the majority vote for choice.
4. The recall of elected officers.
5. The initiative.
6. The referendum.
7. Popular approval required for all important measures.
8. Publicity of all business.
9. Expert accounting.
10. Civil service provisions.

report of the Committee on Commission Form of Government, Comrade Jacobsen, Chairman.

DEL. JACOBSEN (Ia.): The committee has two reports. The two reports are entirely different in their scope, and we have thought it best to make a supplementary report. In the report of the committee there occur one or two serious mistakes, the word "not" being left out in both instances. I would like the delegates to make those corrections that I now mention. In the first line under subdivision 3, "Consideration of the Various Features," that line should read "It will be seen at once that many of these features are not only not objectionable." The last "not" is left out in printing. On page 3 in the third line from the top the line should read "referendum cannot be rescinded by the commission." I have made a change in the last paragraph, and I have changed it so that if the recommendation is adopted the same committee that is provided for in the recommendation will also take up the matter provided in Section 2.

The report of the committee was then read, as follows:

III. CONSIDERATION OF THE VARIOUS FEATURES.

It will be seen at once that many of these features are not only not objectionable from the Socialist point of view, but are actually elements in the Socialist form of government. We cannot, therefore, indiscriminately stand against this commission seriously so from our standpoint. It becomes necessary, therefore, to study each feature by itself.

Furthermore, the form of the law is different in different states. Each state organization, therefore, will have to make a careful study of the law in its own state. With this in mind, we may offer the following observations in regard to the features in the law mentioned above:

1. As to the non-partisan, nominations and elections, this committee holds that they should be opposed. There seems to be a wave among the so-called reform elements throughout the country in behalf of non-partisan municipal elections and administrations. This is perfectly natural in capitalistic circles with us, the Socialist Party, we hold a very definite program and represent a very concrete and vital issue, and the matter is entirely different.

The Old Party voters neither understand nor appreciate the fundamental causes underlying the failures of American municipal government. The conception of the reformers that it is due to the intrusion of national politics into municipal affairs is entirely foolish. And the idea that the elimination of partisan politics from the municipality will solve the problem is equally absurd. The Socialists alone see and understand the fundamental causes of municipal misrule. They see that it lies in a general way in the capitalistic system itself. And this they seek to overthrow. This is the vital element in every municipal problem and the vital issue in every municipal campaign.

The Socialist Party, therefore, with its whole strength must insist upon its rights to keep this issue before the people at every possible point in the whole political situation. And especially is it important that the party shall be able to give its members and those who seek to support its principles an opportunity to do so.

Therefore, the Socialist Party must oppose the elimination of party designation from the ballot because it destroys the facility with which its voting power can be brought to bear in behalf of its principles. And, besides, it tends to confuse the voters and causes principles to be lost sight of and at the same time results in an advantage to those who are able by personal means and resources to obtrude themselves upon the attention of the voters.

In most of the forms of commission law both the primary and secondary elections are made non-partisan by denying the party a right to any designation. We hold that the party should be given its right to designation, at least, in the primary election.

2. ELECTION AT LARGE.

With reference to this provision this committee holds that it should be opposed. We feel that the representation by wards in the legislative body is more democratic. The ward representatives are nearer to the people in the various sections of the city and, therefore, more likely to bring into the legislative body a knowledge of the will and wish of the people. Whatever evils arise from the ward system, as at present organized, may be eliminated by redistricting or other devices. We believe that the advantages of the ward system of representation outweighs the advantages of elections at large because it allows a representation for the minority.

The committee holds that the executive and legislative functions of the city government should be separate. And we hold that a better arrangement than that proposed by the commission form would be ward representation in the council for legislative functions and the election at large for executive functions if that system seem best.

3. MAJORITY ELECTION.

It is perfectly clear that minorities should not rule. There are only two ways in which this can be avoided, either by the form of majority election provided by the commission form of government, or the Socialistic plan of pro-

portional representation. We, therefore, favor some form of proportional representation for the secondary election.

4. The Initiative, Referendum and Recall are, of course, well known Socialist principles. They constitute the most redeeming features in the commission form. However, in many cases the state laws omit one or the other of these provisions, or restrict them with certain limitations as to percentages, time limits, etc., so as to practically nullify them. These details, therefore, should be carefully provided for.

5. PUBLICITY OF BUSINESS AND EXPERT ACCOUNTING.

Several provisions are made in the several laws against secret sessions of the commission. This, of course, would also be an excellent feature. However, in some cases the very section that ostensibly provides against secret sessions is so worded as to make the very opposite possible. For example: the Iowa law reads: "All meetings of the council, either regular or special, at which any person not a city officer is admitted shall be open to the public." Obviously, therefore, this law permits of the meetings of the council to be secret. All that is required is that everyone except officers be excluded and then under the law the meeting is secret. This is a vicious feature of the law and the provision for publicity is not an essential feature of the commission law and could be provided for just as well without it.

6. In some states there are provisions in the law prohibiting the granting of franchises until they are first approved by popular vote. Furthermore, in some cases the law provides that no measure which is once decided upon by a referendum can be rescinded by the commission.

However, it would appear that these features are not essential parts of the commission form inasmuch as they are already required by the state laws in those states, and, furthermore, could without question be secured in any state without the commission form of government.

IV. OBJECTIONABLE FEATURES.

Reviewing the above paragraphs we would urge upon the Party everywhere the necessity of guarding carefully against the objectionable features in the commission form of government. Among these we would call special attention to the following:

1. In the first place there is one serious objection to the whole idea of the commission form of government—it combines the legislative and the executive and judicial functions. These we hold should be kept distinct. The legislative function can be best performed by a representative body elected by the people, preferably from the various localities or words which shall decide upon the policies of the government. The administrative function, however, requires a different type of service, which in its nature calls for exceptional ability and expert administration. We hold that the municipal government may be organized in such a way as to retain all of the advantages of democracy,—an elective body to perform the functions of legislation and supervision and a separate body charged with the function of administration, this guaranteeing both democracy and efficiency.

2. The proposal that the four or five commissioners after being elected shall themselves determine which particular department of public affairs they shall take charge of seems to us particularly unwise. It would seem better to us that the candidates be selected for the various heads of departments with special reference to their qualifications for the particular service required; and that they shall be elected to these respective positions.

3. We also observe a tendency under the commission form to lengthen the tenure of office. This we view with disfavor.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

In view of the above we recommend:

1. That the various local and state organizations be urged to prepare themselves thoroughly to meet the situation created by the commission form of government of cities by appointing special committees and otherwise to study the situation and to make recommendations to their respective organizations.

We further recommend that the congress itself elect a permanent committee to further study the subject and report from time to time in the Socialist Press, and finally to the next National Convention, and in view of the fact that the public utility laws now being enacted by the various states bearing directly upon the question of municipal government, we recommend that the above committee investigate in a similar way and report upon the subject of the state public utility commissions and their bearing upon municipal government.

2. And, in view of the fact that the various primary laws also bear directly upon the matter of the commission form of government of cities, we further recommend that the committee study and report upon the primary election laws in the various states.

J. J. JACOBSEN, Chairman;
CARL D. THOMPSON, Secretary;
WINNIE E. BRANSTETTER,
JASPER M'LEVY,
S. W. ROSE,

Committee,

DEL. JACOBSEN: I move that the report of the committee be received and the recommendations concurred in.

Motion seconded by Delegate De-Bell.

DEL. WILSON: I believe there is a supplementary report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chairman

says he wishes to have that considered separately.

The report of the committee was then adopted.

Delegate Thompson then read the supplementary report of the committee on the Commission Form of Government, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR CITIES

It was the question of what should be the attitude and tactics of the Socialist Party in cities having the commission form of government that led to the appointment of this committee in the first place. This committee, however, felt that a preliminary report covering the general question and setting forth the general features of the law must precede our report on this question. But we have no disposition to shirk the responsibility of facing the problem which the commission form of government forces upon the locals where it is in operation.

The following telegram was received by Delegate J. Stitt Wilson of California, and by him turned over to the committee:

"Question of Party attitude in cities having commission form of government should be decided. Should we voluntarily disfranchise ourselves and refrain from voting after losing out at primaries? Hope you have full information San Diego case."

Comrade Wilson also presented documents giving a statement of the case. It is typical of what has already happened in other cities and undoubtedly will happen in a great many more. So it is worthy of consideration.

In brief, the situation is as follows:

"The San Diego city charter prohibits all party action, party designations and party tickets. There are two elections—a nominating or primary election, and the election proper. To secure a place on the official primary ballot the candidate must file with the city clerk his personal verified notice of candidacy, also a petition supporting such candidacy, signed by not less than fifty electors of the city. There is no limit to the number of candidates permissible at this election. In prescribing the form of the primary ballot the charter reads as follows: 'The ballots shall have no party or other designation or mark whatever.' The election is held under the general election laws, and the returns are made and certified to by the city clerks in the usual way. These returns are officially canvassed by the Common Council and the results published in the city papers. The charter provision prescribing the form of the official final ballot, and what it shall contain, is in part as follows: 'The two candidates receiving the highest number of votes for each of the offices to be filled, except for the members

of the Common Council and Board of Education, shall be the candidates and the only candidates whose names shall be placed on the ballot for said office. In the case of the Common Council and Board of Education, each composed of five members, the names of the ten candidates for each body, receiving the highest vote, are put on the ballot."

The case then is this,—The state constitution of the Socialist Party of California compels the party organization in every locality to put up a distinctly designated Socialist Party ticket. The state and charter laws of California under the commission form of government makes it impossible. The provisions of the state constitution are very rigid, however. It prescribes that a local's charter may be revoked, (Sec. 14, Div. c) "For nominating as a candidate any person not a member of the Socialist Party, or for supporting, aiding or failing to repudiate, and expel from the party any candidate, even though the regular nominee of the party, who shall accept any nomination, made with or without his consent, by any other political organization or party, or allow the same to stand without protest in the public press and other available means, or for neglecting to make nominations where there are members who have signified their willingness to serve."

The California constitution further declares that any member may be expelled,—(Sec. 9, Div. b and c), "For voting for, or aiding the election of any candidate on any ticket other than the Socialist Party ticket." "For voting the official primary ticket of any individual or organization other than the Socialist Party."

Here then is a party constitution only a year old and a single turn in capitalistic evolution in government puts the whole party organization out of gear, disfranchises the comrades completely, ties them up in their own party entanglement, and, worst of all, reopens at once most serious party controversies.

Clearly we must not allow ourselves to be so easily put out of the battle. And certainly we must not allow the capitalist politician to strangle us with our own constitutional limitations.

It is perfectly clear that an intelligent, aggressive working class thoroughly aroused to the issues of a fierce struggle in which they are conscious that their lives and welfare of their class is in the balance will not sit idly by nor consent to their own disfranchisement when they know they have in their own hands the power to turn the tide of battle for better conditions for themselves and the industrial masses.

Such a course would be in itself both denial and abandonment of the class struggle. And we hold that whatever be the difficulties or danger of the battle that capitalism forces upon us as a party, above all things WE MUST NEVER FOR ONE MOMENT IN ANY CITY OR STATE ABANDON THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

Your committee would point out that for many years our comrades of the great European countries have faced just such situations as this. Some of them have never had any other opportunity. In Germany, for example, the comrades have their candidates in the primary election. They strive hard to win a place on the second ballot. But if they fail, and they often do, they do not therefore refuse to vote in the second election. Much less do they force their comrades to disfranchise themselves.

The permission of our comrades to vote in the secondary elections, where capitalistic laws deprive us of our own candidates is, therefore, a well established tactic of international Socialism. The committee holds that our American comrades would be willing to learn from their experience and follow their example.

Your committee would further point out that our national constitution does not prevent our comrades from taking part in a secondary election from which their candidates have been eliminated, assuming that they have done their full duty to win a place for their candidates in such an election.

Furthermore, your committee would point out that this situation will pertain only to the earlier stages of the movement in each locality. As soon as the party grows strong enough to capture second place in any locality the difficulty disappears.

The committee therefore is of the opinion that:

RESOLVED, That wherever the capitalistic election laws, whether under the commission form of government or otherwise prohibit the use of party can-

dicates and party designations on the ballot that our comrades be advised:— 1. To use every possible means to get their own party candidates on the ticket to maintain as completely as possible their own distinct party organization and party campaign.

2. To use every device possible under the law to make the party candidates known to the public.

3. To use their utmost energies to win a place for their distinct party candidates on the secondary election ballot.

4. And finally having done all this, if they fail to win in the primary, the Congress advises the comrades nevertheless not to abandon the struggle, but to leave their members free to vote in the second election.

5. And since the tactics of the international movement does not aim to disfranchise our comrades under complicated election laws, and since our national constitution does not impose arbitrary restrictions, the Congress, therefore, advises the state organizations to revise their constitutions so that our members shall not be disfranchised nor our locals suspended or disrupted for no other reason than for encountering new and unexpected complications arising from capitalistic election laws, such as the new commission form of government imposes.

DEL. THOMPSON: I move the adoption of the supplementary report. (Seconded.)

DEL. LONDON (Jewish Agi. Bu.): A question of personal privilege. While I was away with another delegation I understand a motion was made and carried that an Immigration Committee be appointed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will Comrade Wilson say whether it was to continue the same committee?

DEL. WILSON: That was my intention, but I am perfectly willing that a committee be elected.

DEL. LONDON: I ask that this committee be increased by two.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please talk to Comrade Wilson about that.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I would like to move an addition to the report.

DEL. WILDE (Cal.): Comrade Chairman and Comrades, for the first time in the congress I take the floor to speak upon a subject with which I am to some extent familiar, and that is the commission form of government in California. I just want to make a few remarks on the supplementary report that has been given here, and to show you just exactly where the party would stand in any state where the direct primary law is adopted together with the commission form of government. Fortunately for California, the comrades have discovered a loophole through which they escape the intention of the capitalistic class to place such a burden upon the party as to practically destroy it. If the primary law was such that it could not have been evaded the Socialist Party of

California would find itself in this position, that they would be to the expense of somewhere approximating \$10,000 in order to get their candidates on the ticket throughout the whole state, that is, including the counties and the congressmen as well. They would have to pay a fee aggregating \$10,000. I have made a few items here to show you what I mean. For instance, governor and seven other state officials, a fee of \$50 each, \$400; eight congressmen, \$25 each, \$200; 120 state senators and assemblymen, \$10 each, \$1,200; 570 county officials, averaging \$10 each, \$5,700. This does not include something over 200 supervisors at \$10 each, which would be \$2,000, making a total, though it does not take into consideration a number of officers that I have not named, which brings it up to a total of \$9,500.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask the comrade, are you speaking to the commission form of government?

DEL. WILDE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or primary elections?

DEL. WILDE: Both. I wanted to speak to both of them in order to show what the result would be if you had a commission form of government in the cities and a primary law should be adopted in the state.

THE CHAIRMAN: Confine yourself as far as possible to the subject before the house.

DEL. WILDE: Now, if we had, as I want to point out, a commission form of government in the cities and a primary law without any loophole whatsoever, we would find ourselves in

this position: After we have gone to the expense of nominating all our candidates for the various offices throughout the state and the cities, and they failed before the primary election and we found ourselves defeated so that we could not have them placed on the ballot in the by-election, we would be at the expense of this \$10,000 and would have no candidate in the field. I simply want to make that statement so that the comrades will understand. It doesn't seem to be clear in the report.

Now, the question of adopting the supplementary report is up for consideration. I want to speak in opposition to the adoption of that report, and I want to call the comrades' attention to one part of this supplementary report. You will find it under the resolutions, and it is numbered four: "And finally, having done all this, if they fail to win in the primary, the congress advises the comrades nevertheless not to abandon the struggle, but to leave their members free to vote in the second election." I am opposed to this for the reason that it is going to breed confusion and cause controversy. I would like to point out the way that the California comrades have avoided this under the commission form of government. In Berkeley, we were defeated in the nomination election, and therefore had no place upon the election in the by-election. In order that we might show our hand in that by-election we simply wrote in the names of the candidates, and I think that this supplementary report should be so worded as to make it plain to this congress that it is not going to allow any member of the party the privilege of voting for any capitalistic candidate under the commission form of government, and that we should insert the names of the candidates who failed at the first nomination election. Therefore—

I move as an amendment that this clause be stricken out. (Seconded.)

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I would like to amend by adding Section 5. Strike out both 4 and 5. They are both of the same character.

DEL. WILDE: I accept that.

DEL. WILSON: I received a telegram, as stated, from the State of California. Our comrades have been in a difficulty, and one of the strongest locals in the State of California has been torn to shreds over this question, and barely escaped the suspension of

its charter. Now, they have wired to me as a representative from California, and consulted me before I came here with reference to this question whether our members are going to be disfranchised or not. I will ask the attention of this limited number of delegates to this question. If you read the first paragraph of this report you will see that some of the most important states of this Union will sooner or later be confronted with the question of adopting a primary law and the commission form of government, and what we already have in the State of California you are going to have at your own door. As I say, the introduction of these two new laws has caused one of the most serious internal strife in our party in the State of California. One of the strongest locals in the state has been torn to shreds and has barely escaped with its charter on this account, opening the door for attack of every kind and description, and these comrades figured with me before I left the State, and they have wired to me to introduce this matter to the congress. I did not believe I could secure such consideration from the congress as has already been given to this subject. A full report and the whole matter opened up for our consideration, was more than I expected. The great difficulty is the question of the disfranchisement of our members under these special conditions. We have shown a remarkable ability, every time we have had a question, to go back and fall back on fundamental principles without answering the questions that we are here to settle. Now, I do not believe you are going to settle this question. It is too late in the congress to settle it. You have given me no answer. You have given California no answer. You have given no other state any answer. The committee has done its best, and I am not prepared to say that the recommendations at the close of this are just what they ought to be, but it is perfectly idle to say to our members, "We cannot help you if you are disfranchised. Stand your ground and beat time." I submit that this is a serious matter. It will cost us \$10,000 in the State of California this fall to put up a full ticket. We cannot do it, and we have had to resort to a subterfuge even to get the heads of our ticket nominated, and I am a little on the anxious seat yet about whether that subterfuge will

carry through without legal trouble. Our enemies, the capitalists, will be ready to fight, and they will see to it that that is a source of trouble to us. Now, I am not ready to say, I have not given it consideration enough to say, that these two paragraphs at the close should be retained. I cannot advise. It is too concrete a matter to give an immediate and quick decision about it. Therefore, I am simply saying that the comrades in our state and in the states of the union where this is a matter of consideration, and serious consideration, do not want glittering generalities; they want some kind of advice upon a concrete difficulty.

DEL. MORGAN: I would like to see these two paragraphs stricken out. I was half asleep when he first read them, but they were not so obscure but what I understood their meaning. It means, if we adopt them, that our comrades have the authority of the party to go out and vote for non-Socialists, capitalistic candidates. If we have members in our party that have got the voting disease so bad that they cannot wait until they can vote for Socialists, they better go and join the capitalist parties altogether. When I became a Socialist there was no opportunity to vote, and no prospect of voting. That didn't bother me. I understood that I had been a fool in voting the capitalist ticket up to that time, and it didn't bother me when I was going to have a chance to vote the Socialist ticket. I was going to stop voting for my masters, and I waited, nearly five years before I had a chance to vote. When this party was first organized the desire to vote was not as prominent as it is now. The desire was to educate the working men. When I was on the National Committee in 1877 there was a section that wanted to go into political action, and the majority of the members, being old International Workingmen's Association men, that believed in the economic movement and not in the political movement, were inclined to deny the right to go into political action. I as an English-speaking member, supposing that we could reach a greater number of persons through political agitation, I also voted to have our organization go into political action, with the advice that we went into it to educate and not to vote to elect somebody. Now, there has been a loosening of ties all around. The desire to vote,

the desire to elect somebody, is carrying our movement outside of a Socialist limitations altogether, and we are becoming a populist organization with a strong desire to get into some office. That has got to be checked. It opens the door to everything. I don't care what your trouble is in California. If you have good Socialists out there they will wait till they can vote for straight Socialist candidates. (Applause.)

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): I have not been in the Socialist movement many years, but I see one thing I never expected to see. I have lived to see Comrade Morgan stand on the floor of a Socialist convention and defend the anarchist position, and it is at least interesting.

DEL. MORGAN: That is news to me.

DEL. SIMONS: But two years ago he stood upon the floor of our national convention and helped to put into our platform the proposition that any man who dared even to speak against political action should be forever put out of the movement. Now, he comes here with a half compliment to the old Bakunin International Workingmen's Association that did not believe in political action at all. Well, "the world do move," but some people move the wrong way. Now then, this question today of whether we are going to allow our own citizens to be disfranchised or not is something at least worthy of consideration. When the capitalist class attempt to disfranchise us we get out upon the streets and we riot, we fight, we declare that there is nothing on earth that is not justifiable in an attempt to secure the right to express our opinions as a part of the government. We have seen our comrades in Russia lay down their lives in the face of machine guns and bayonets for the right to vote, to cast their ballots. We have seen this fight go on, and now we have a proposition to do what? It is proposed that we shall, by our own action, make it possible for us to be disfranchised and not have the right to express our opinions. You tell us that voting at a second ballot is something that the International Socialists would not stand for. Why, it is a thing that is done in every country of Europe. It is a thing that is favored in every country of Europe where it is done. It is a thing that is

accepted and endorsed all over the world. I tell you, we do need some education in the Socialist movement; we need it, and we need it badly. I am not afraid to stand on the floor of this congress and tell you things that you do not like to hear. I am not afraid to stand on the floor of this congress and say that this discussion shows that a great mass of members here do not know something of the tactics of international Socialism. I do not care if they were sixteen or fourteen or ten-year-old boys and had been in the movement only two years, I would expect them to find out more about the international Socialist movement than has been expressed on this floor. This movement is growing. It has extended all over the world, and yet we are told that we ought to decide to have nothing to do with it. The only Socialist mayor that we have in the far west today, at Grand Junction, was elected under the commission form of government, under this very system of voting on the preferential ballot, which means that people vote first for their own ticket, and if that fails they may vote for some one else. I want to say that if you do what is proposed you say to the capitalists that all you have to do is to change our constitution, and put a few tricks in it so as to tie our hands. These are things that we all ought to know and study and understand, because they do not require a great deal of study. You cannot find one man in Europe that does not know these things. You cannot settle this question by an appeal to prejudice or by denunciation. I believe in the class struggle, and I believe in voting while possible and working along those lines. I believe that if the Socialist Party ever were to be disqualified entirely, then there is no question but what we would have to fight. But if we are simply to tie ourselves up in a knot, then we have nobody to blame but ourselves. And that is what we are being asked to do if we refuse to adopt these lines of tactics. Of course, the world won't go to smash if we don't. Personally, I do not expect any great, tremendous effect. As to the fellows in California, I believe it will make it possible out there in California for the Socialist Party to be hamstrung and tied. It will make it possible for the Socialist Party still to remain just

a little bit of a faction out there that stands to one side in the great class struggle and let the battle go on all around them while they beat the air and howl at the fight going on around them. But I do not want to see that if I can help it. I want to see a Socialist movement that moves intelligently and with system, improving its opportunities at every single point, working for a part of the program until we can vote for the whole proposition, until the working class can rule.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I am not in favor of striking out these last two paragraphs because I do not think that we ought to tie the hands of the comrades, but I think it ought to be explicit so that the comrades would not be compelled to vote for somebody that is not a party member, and I therefore move to amend section 4 so that it will read: "And finally, having done all this, if they fail to win in the primary, the congress advises the comrades not to abandon the struggle, but to vote for party members in the second election."

DEL. MORGAN: That is all right.

DEL. THOMPSON: But they would not be on the ballot.

DEL. MERRICK: Yes, but they can vote for them. Is it the idea to vote for somebody not in the party?

DEL. MORGAN: Sure, that is what it means.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I move this as an amendment. (Seconded.)

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): It is not often that I find myself in disagreement with Comrade Simons and in agreement with Comrade Morgan, but at this particular point I am in agreement with Morgan. It is utterly misleading to say that the Socialists in Germany have a right to vote on the second ballot, and that therefore the Socialists in the United States should have that right. Because, in Germany the second ballot means that they vote for a little disintegrating party of the middle class whose interests are more proletarian than capitalistic. But in the United States voting in the second ballot means nothing else but voting for the Union Labor party or the Democratic Party or Republican Party, and to that I am utterly opposed. What we want to know in California is, if we cannot vote for the Socialist Party shall we vote for any of the other three parties who are either bogus labor parties or strictly

capitalist parties, or shall we have the privilege of writing the names of our candidates on the other ballot and defending the class struggle position by remaining true to the general attitude of the Socialist Party, "No compromise, no political dealing?"

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I certainly think if you strike out the last two sections as they are in the supplementary report, that the first three will carry. I believe our attitude in connection with the general view that prevails with those who are observing the commission form of government will be the means of developing some method, ways or means that we will get recognition; that means to get recognition in the primaries, and not attempt to land our candidates as we would by straddling the question. To allow us to vote at the second ballots when the reform element struggle to gain control throughout the land, is only another way of confusing the working class. I want to eliminate that as much as possible. So I trust that the supplementary report will carry, with the exception of the amendment as offered, striking out sections 4 and 5.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I desire to offer an amendment. The supplementary report as we have it here does not put us on record as being opposed to the enactment of laws designed to prohibit the use of party emblems or the use of party candidates. So I believe there should be inserted here a clause specifically stating that we are opposed utterly to the enactment of such laws, and therefore—

I desire to move the insertion of this resolution just before this present resolution, so that it will read as follows:

"Resolved, That the Socialist Party stands opposed to the enactment of any laws designed to prohibit the use of party candidates, or party emblems." And then "Be it further Resolved," etc.

The purpose of that is that where such laws are before the legislature our comrades will then be instructed to go before the legislature and put forth every effort against the passage of such enactments. As it stands now it is not clear.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I accept the proposition. I think every member of the committee would accept that suggestion. Isn't that so, Comrade Jacobsen?

DEL. JACOBSEN: Yes.

DEL. THOMPSON: Because that was the original purpose of the committee in every case. I think the comrades do not realize as they will if they look over the last part of the report carefully, and particularly this which we have just accepted, that we have very carefully safeguarded the party so far as fusion or confusion is concerned. We have reiterated and re-emphasized the fact that we urge the comrades everywhere to do everything they possibly can to put up a big fight to the last ditch to have their own candidate with the party designation. They are advised to do everything under the law that is possible to get their candidates on the secondary ballot. That is understood, and we want to safeguard that. We want to make every possible provision against any possible fusion or deal or compromise or anything of that sort. Now, there have been a number of suggestions of devices that might be used, like writing the name in or writing the word "Socialist" or putting on a sticker, and so on. But the trouble with those devices is this, that in some states, and particularly where the commission form of government is in operation, this action would simply destroy their ballots entirely. It would simply make them illegal and they would be thrown out and would not be counted, and you would simply lose your vote.

But to come down to this proposition, the recommendation of the committee is simply this, that you fight to the last ditch for the party designation, and all the party candidates in the primary election, and fight through the primary election for your own independent party to get your men as candidates in the secondary election. That is the first proposition. But after you have done that, then what about the secondary election if you fail? Until you get to be a second party, on this basis you will fail. Shall we then say to all our comrades that they must simply not vote at all? Now, that is the question.

DEL. MORGAN: Sure.

DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. THOMPSON: Simply disqualify them?

DELEGATES: Sure.

DEL. THOMPSON: If that is your proposition, then I want to say that I think we are moving back to the anarchist position, absolutely to the

impossiblistic position, to stay out of the election and not vote. In a situation of that sort you are going to find it practically impossible to get your organization into operation. You will find that there will be a lot of people who are considering whether or not they are going to use the Socialist Party as the expression of their political struggle, but who are practically compelled to stand off and look on the party as an obstruction.

DEL. GOEBEL: May I ask a question?

DEL. THOMPSON: Sure.

DEL. GOEBEL: I would like to ask you this question. Do you recognize any difference between candidates that are standing for the capitalist system?

DEL. THOMPSON: Certainly I do. There is a great deal of difference. All are, of course, worse than the Socialist candidates, and we would like to have all the candidates to be comrades.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): Will you permit a question?

DEL. THOMPSON: Sure.

DEL. UNTERMANN: Is it not a fact that the German Socialist Party for nearly a generation did not take part in the state elections of Prussia, but only in the national elections of Germany?

DEL. THOMPSON: Yes, and it is also a fact that the same men in the early stages of the Socialist movement advocated not voting at all.

DEL. UNTERMANN: And they did not.

DEL. THOMPSON: And they did not; that is a fact.

DEL. UNTERMANN: That is what I wanted to know.

DEL. THOMPSON: But, comrades, that was 50 years ago.

DEL. UNTERMANN: No, it was not.

DEL. THOMPSON: And no Socialist Party in the world today stands depending solely upon non-political methods, and the time is past, and especially in America, where we are going to go back and repudiate the ballot. The ballot is our weapon, and we must organize our political party. Here is the question, I understand, as to whether or not we are going to leave the people in our movement free to use the ballot at the last election, and I am in favor of letting them use it, after safeguarding it at every point.

The position of the Socialist Party is, no fusion, and no trimming. We want to avoid that, but after we have done everything we can do, then I am opposed, and I believe the party membership are going to be opposed, to unnecessary restrictions. This is a question as to whether or not we are going to give our comrades a chance to use their political power intelligently. If they cannot use it in one way they can do it in another. I want to remind you that our committee, after a number of sessions and studying the matter carefully, have brought in a unanimous report and it is here before you, and I am in favor of giving our comrades every liberty to speak on it. Under restrictions such as are provided here, we are not afraid of fusion or confusion. It seems to me our comrades are needlessly alarmed about situations of that sort. As our party grows stronger, as it grows better, as it becomes more disciplined and better educated we ought to be able to trust it. Let us be careful to guard each point as we have done in this report, and after we have done that, then let us not take a position that practically strangles us on the political field and gives the other people a chance to tie our hands.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I want to ask the Chairman of the committee a question. He has stated that the ballot was a weapon of defense. If we use the ballot to vote for capitalist candidates, is it not also a weapon of destruction?

DEL. SIMONS: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The debate is closed, but a point of order is in order.

DEL. SIMONS: I desire to ask the Chairman of the committee if he knows the position of the English Socialist parties on this question, both the S. D. F. and the I. L. P.

DEL. THOMPSON: No.

DEL. M'DERMOTT (Mont.): Does this mean that each individual man is to use his own judgment about voting?

DEL. THOMPSON: It is to be left to the state as an organization.

DEL. M'DERMOTT: That is the question.

The question was then put on the adoption of Delegate Merrick's substitute for section 4.

DEL. MORGAN: Section 5 was linked with number 4.

mittee as it stands. We are going to do it by correspondence.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the committee which is to investigate the Commission Form of Government stand as a permanent committee of this congress.

The motion was put and carried.

IN MEMORIAM.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS (Ill.): Comrade Chairman and Delegates, the matter which I present to you now will only occupy about one minute. The City of Chicago yesterday sustained the loss of one of the most ardent and faithful of our workers. He is well known to everybody in Chicago, and the delegates from other parts of the country will lose nothing by at this time making the acquaintance of his name, Comrade C. E. Kirkland, one of the old time Socialists here, always working for the party and for our principles and everything connected with social activity. And as a delegate from Illinois I move you the following:

"We, the delegates of the National Congress of the Socialist Party of the United States, express our deep regret at the death of our loyal comrade and always untiring worker, C. E. Kirkland. We extend our sympathies to the members of his bereaved family, and commend his noble example to all who wish to work effectively in the cause of the working class."

This comrade died yesterday in a hospital after having been sick and undergoing several operations. About an hour before his death he delivered an address on Socialism to the rest of the patients in the ward, which is reported by those who heard it as having been one of the best addresses on Socialism heard by those folks, or probably by a good many others. It is a testimony to the zeal of our comrade, even to the hour of his death. I therefore present this resolution to the congress.

DEL. HUBSCHMITT (N. J.): I move the adoption of the resolution.

The motion was unanimously carried.

IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): It is necessary to reconsider the motion that we have a committee on immigration. I move to reconsider the motion on the Committee on Immigration, in

order to make an election instead of continuing the present committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that reconsideration is not necessary, for the reason that the motion heretofore was not to continue the present committee, but to continue the committee; the continuance of the committee as a committee, but not the present members. If there is no objection that will be the ruling of the house. We will proceed then when you are ready for the selection of that committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next thing in regular order is the continuation of the report of the Committee on Resolutions.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions if there is anything important in the rest of the report that we cannot agree on.

DEL. DE BELL: I move to endorse the action of the Resolution Committee as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: Without reporting?

DEL. DE BELL: Yes.

Manifestations of dissent were made by several delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: That motion is out of order.

SEC. BARNES: I would like information from the Chairman of the Resolution Committee how long, in his judgment, it would take to make the report.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): We have eleven resolutions which we report favorably, and I do not think any one of them is contentious. We have a considerable number which we report unfavorably, and it will depend on the movers of those resolutions whether they think it advisable to bring them up for discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will consider a motion to the effect that the resolutions reported unanimously unfavorably by the committee shall not be reported to the congress. Do I hear a second?

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the resolutions which the committee does not recommend

unanimously shall not be reported to the congress.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move that they be printed in the record.

THE CHAIRMAN: As unfavorably reported?

DEL. MORGAN: Yes, just as the committee reports them, as unfavorably reported.

THE CHAIRMAN: Only those unfavorably reported?

DEL. MORGAN: Yes. The motion was put and carried.

DEL. LEE, reporting on behalf of the committee: With the exception of the Labor Union resolution the report is unanimous, either unanimously favorable or unanimously unfavorable.

The following resolution was read:

"Resolved, That this congress congratulates Comrade Fred Warren of the Appeal to Reason upon the splendid fight he has made for the preservation of the working class press, and expresses the fullest hope that the struggle in which he is engaged may come to a successful termination."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

FREE PRESS FIGHT.

"Whereas, The struggle in New Castle has culminated in the issuance of an injunction against a thousand of the employes of the steel trust out on strike, and in the attempt to discredit the officials of the city elected by the Socialist Party and to crush the organ of the party, the 'Free Press,' by fining and imprisoning its editors; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the congress of the Socialist Party of America call upon the members of the Party everywhere to rally to the support of our comrades in Newcastle, Pa., by contributing as liberally as possible to their defense fund."

The resolution was adopted.

The following resolution, offered by Delegate O'Hare of Kansas, was read:

WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC.

Whereas, By the recent exposures of the press and governmental reports the public mind is at this time much aroused over the white slave traffic, and since the Socialist Party offers the only solution to this problem, be it

Resolved, 1. That it is the sense of this congress that organizers, lecturers

AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 21, 1910

and the press of the Socialist Party should give careful attention to this subject, always laying stress upon the economic cause of prostitution and the white slave traffic.

2. That we request the Woman's Committee to have prepared for distribution suitable literature on the subject.

The resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

SOCIALIST PLATE MATTER.

That the National office furnish the labor papers free with plate service presenting the Socialist position to the trade union papers for the purpose of offsetting the anti-Socialist articles furnished to the labor press by the civic federation and other organizations.

DEL. SIMONS: A point of information. Make it mandatory that they shall send this out, because I know from our own individual experience that we have found that it did not work, that is all.

The resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

That the National Executive Committee be directed to publish periodically propaganda booklets, tracts and leaflets on the general subject of the aims and methods of the Socialist movement, as well as upon special phases of the latter, notably its bearing upon the struggles of labor and other progressive social movements, and upon the most important events and conditions arising in the industrial, political and social life of the country. Such booklets, tracts and leaflets, as well as all other literature on Socialism, to be handled by the National Literature Bureau, and to be sold to the local and state organizations as nearly as possible at cost. The National Secretary shall be authorized to place the work of the Literature Bureau in charge of a special assistant who shall give his whole time to the work.

The resolution was adopted.

DEL. LEE: The next is a resolution from New York in connection with the same subject of literature. This would go as a recommendation of the congress only:

"Resolved, That the party should pay greater attention than heretofore to the sale and circulation of appropriate

Socialist propaganda literature, and that the state and local organizations of the party throughout the country be advised to employ comrades at a minimum guaranteed wage to engage in the sale of such literature in their respective localities as a regular occupation."

The resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

The congress strongly advises all state and local organizations of the party to give careful study to the subject of workmen's compensation laws, to train a corps of speakers and writers qualified to deal with the subject, and to inaugurate a systematic and persistent campaign for the enactment of such laws and for their improvement in any cases where they may be enacted in an unsatisfactory form.

The congress instructs the National Executive Committee to assume the duty of correlating the efforts of the various state and local organizations on this line, assisting them in the collection and exchange of information, the training of speakers and writers, the publication and distribution of literature, so as to give the movement a nation-wide scope.

The congress invites the labor unions of all trades and industries to join with the party in the prosecution of this work, and urges the party organizations in every industrial center to enter into conference with the local central labor bodies for that purpose.

It was moved and seconded that the resolution be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the Chairman may be permitted to state, this is especially necessary to be done through our national office, in view of the fact that there is a national wage movement to secure compensation laws especially favorable to the laborers.

The motion was put and the resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

INDUSTRIAL TRAINING.

"Resolved, That a committee on education, consisting of five members, shall be appointed by the National Executive Committee, for the purpose of investigating the subject of the introduction of industrial, trade, or vocational training in the public schools of

the various states, and to ascertain its relation to the welfare of the working-class; the committee shall gather all possible information and data on the subject, and shall, from time to time, publish such data and information, and shall make such recommendations to the next National Convention as they may deem necessary and advisable for action by the Socialist Party."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

MEXICO AND LATIN-AMERICAN COUNTRIES.

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Socialist Party of the United States, demand that the government of this country shall not interfere in the affairs of Mexico and other Latin-American countries. That we are unalterably opposed to the powers of this nation being used to buttress any foreign despotism."

DEL. LEE: The committee reports unanimously favorably upon this resolution. I believe our Comrade DeLara of Mexico, or late of Mexico, would like to address a word now to this congress upon the subject, and I believe we would be glad to have you give a little time for that purpose, if the congress feels that it can.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS (III.): I move that Comrade De Lara be given thirty minutes.

At the suggestion of delegates the time was reduced to twenty-five minutes. A motion was made to lay on the table, but was not pressed, and Comrade De Lara was given twenty-five minutes, and spoke as follows:

COMRADE L. GUITERREZ DE LARA: It is the great happiness of my life to be before you, comrades. I come here in the name of seventy-five millions of workingmen; seventy-five millions that for more than one hundred years have carried on the most tremendous struggle for freedom ever known in the history of the world. You do not know that, and that is why I come here to tell you. You comrades, you know very much about American capitalism in Mexico; many of you have told me of your great hopes that Mexico would be annexed to the United States. All right. You know things that concern the capitalist class, but you do not know what concerns the Latin-American working

class, and I come to tell you their troubles.

For 100 years the working class, the proletariat of the Latin-American countries—not the middle class, but the proletariat of the Latin-American countries—have carried on the most tremendous struggle for their emancipation. Spain for 300 years ruled Latin-America, and with the class of Spain was the class of the Catholic Church, and I am going to talk about the Catholic Church as a capitalist corporation. The Kings of Spain came in Latin-America, and the land owners of Spain, and for 300 years they have been increasing their property, their land, until 100 years ago the struggle with the opponents of Spain was nothing else than a struggle of the proletariat of Latin-America in order to take away from the Catholic Church the lands that they were needing. After 300 years of Spanish rule Spain furnished to the Catholic Church the executive force of soldiers and the government. When Spain is defeated in Latin-America the Catholic Church can have no more hope, can have no more executive help from the army of Spain or the military force of Spain. Then what did the Catholic Church do? Simply go to France and England for the last hundred years. That is why we have in the Latin-American countries revolutions that are nothing else but the rebellion of the proletariat against the soldiery and against the Catholic Church by the Latin-American countries. Those revolutions that you despise so much, those revolutions have been suppressed not only by means of the soldiery and the Catholic Church, but by foreign intervention carried on by France and England in the last century. At last the Latin-American countries were not strong enough to stop this intervention of France and England. The Monroe doctrine of the United States was proclaimed. But do you know that the respectability of a people is not in black and white on paper? The respectability of a people is shown in its struggles, in the shedding of blood, not by what is written on paper.

The proletarians of the Latin-American countries have conquered some freedom for themselves in their tremendous struggles, and when they have stopped European intervention, now appears the intervention of the United States, an intervention that is

nothing else but an attempt to suppress the revolt of the proletariat. If you will read the history of the Mexican proletariat you will see that they rose against the ruling class in Mexico, and when the proletariat had conquered their emancipation the French army came to Mexico to crush down that emancipation, and when the proletariat was crushed by the tremendous war with France, then came the soldiery and the military despotism of today. And now when the proletariat again has got ready to revolt, the United States is supporting that despotism. But the masses of the people in the United States begin to see the real situation. The American masters know that the people of this country would oppose a policy that would mean a great amount of bloodshed, and that is why the American government has not dared to send soldiers down to Mexico to enforce despotism in Mexico, because the masters here are afraid of the masses, and the master class cannot so easily fool the masses and get them to murder each other. Then what do they do? The Mexican despot began to realize that the great interest of the United States was in the Catholic Church; the despots of Mexico know that, and by a combination with Mr. Roosevelt and by his permission the Mexican people are to pay two million dollars at once to the Catholic Church of California and \$40,000 a year for the time to come. And since the time that combination was made, Mr. Roosevelt has been very popular with the Catholics in the United States and the Catholics in the United States are his greatest supporters. That is the reason the American government is persecuting the Mexican refugees; not because of American capital in Mexico. The American capitalist in Mexico does not rule the same as the capitalist class here. The real reason for the attitude of the United States is nothing else but the friendship of the Catholic Church. In the small republic of Nicaragua, with half a million population, the Catholic Church was vanquished very many years ago. The same Catholic Church organized another political party and has started a revolutionary movement against Zelaya. The Catholic party started that revolution, and everybody knows that the revolution has been carried on in that country with American money, and Amer-

ican emissaries have gone to Nicaragua to give moral support to that Catholic Church revolution. In six months more than 3,000 working men have fallen in that revolution, and this government is doing nothing in order to stop that destruction of the working class.

Comrades, my time is too short to explain to you more than that. But at least I will tell you that in the Latin-American countries the Socialist movement is growing. In the Argentine Republic, in Chili, in Ecuador, in Peru and Brazil, the Socialist movement is growing, and maybe in some places like Argentine and Brazil it is growing as rapidly as in the United States. From Mexico day before yesterday I got a letter in which I am told that two weeks ago the Clerks' Associations all over the country on the first of May paraded in the streets in about half a dozen of the largest cities of the country; they paraded the streets singing the *Marsellaise* and shouting for Socialism.

But, comrades, the Socialist principles, the principles advocated by the working class, are against the soldiery, against intervention, against anything that causes the destruction of lives or reduces the economic condition of the working people. It is your duty to oppose any intervention by the American government in the Latin-American countries, because that intervention means nothing else but the crushing down the revolt of the proletariat. And now the despots in those Latin-American countries understand that the people, the proletariat, have no other way to get rid of despotism but by way of revolt. If the proletariat revolt the American government will interfere and subject them to a more brutal despotism than the despotism that they suffer from. That is why the proletariat in Mexico, who have the traditions of hundreds of years of struggle in order to build up that nationality, is not willing to be enslaved, to be exploited, to be murdered, and that is why they want to preserve the nationality that they have built up and secure their future emancipation. When the despots of Mexico, like other despots, are told by the proletariat that the only way to get rid of their rule is by a revolt, the American government will interfere, and then we, the proletarians will suffer.

Now, comrades, I believe it is your

duty to give us the moral help that we need. You must speak to the government here by rising and protesting; you must do everything possible in order to make the master class understand that you are against any interference that will mean the support of despotism in the Latin-American countries. Don't you know, comrades, that today the master class are building everywhere large buildings in order to give shelter to international and foreign peace societies? The masters, aye, even the Czar of Russia, talk a good deal against war. But do you know why? Not because they are such good people. Not because they believe in the doctrine of human brotherhood, but because they realize that the masses are no longer so likely to fight and butcher each other. It is not simply because they want to become leaders of men, and to say, "We are the great ones, we are the good ones." If the masses do not destroy each other, it is because we do not allow them to do so. So, comrades, you are in these conditions and realize and understand them. Last week in Chicago and in Washington there was a movement started in order to give a church one of those international peace houses. We do not need that kind of peace. Let them give it to the proletariat in Mexico, the peace that has been refused them by the master class. We do not want favor from the master class. You want to establish the principle of solidarity, and to fight with us for human happiness and for the solidarity of the working class. We do not want favors, because those favors can be taken away from the people when the master class pleases to do so. We want the real solidarity of justice, of duty, of obligation, that is the solidarity of the working class, in order to have in the time to come the emancipation of the whole working class of the world. I thank you very much. (Applause.)

Thereupon on motion of Delegate A. M. Lewis the resolution was adopted.

The committee next submitted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the National Executive Committee be instructed to give its public approval to the manifesto issued by the International Socialist Bureau on behalf of the struggling Finnish people against the aggressions of the Russian autocracy."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

The following resolution, submitted to the committee by Delegate Gaylord of Wisconsin, was read:

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM.

"Resolved, That a Committee on Congressional Program to consist of nine (9) members be chosen by the N. E. C. to report a program for the year's congressional campaign, the same to be submitted to the party referendum. The program shall state, among other matters, the attitude of the party nationally relative to the subjects of Unemployment, Industrial Compensation, Conservation, Hunger Tariff, International Peace and Judicial Usurpation."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): As I understand, the National Executive Committee is to select this committee, but the names are to be submitted to referendum?

DEL. GAYLORD: No.

DEL. LEE: No, the report is to be submitted.

On motion the resolution was adopted.

The next resolution, submitted by Delegates Furman and Passage of New York, was read:

ON DEPORTATION.

"Resolved, That the Socialist Party declares its condemnation of the abusive methods employed by the United States Government in keeping out and deporting immigrants who come to this country."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

DEL. LEE: The following resolution was introduced by Delegates Royal of South Carolina, Morton of North Carolina, Barnes of Louisiana, Lanfersiek of Kentucky, Slatton of Virginia, Haines of Tennessee, and Rose of Mississippi:

"The undersigned, composing all the delegates from the section of the country south of the Ohio River, represent to this congress that it should be the policy of the national organization to constantly hold up the hands of the organizations of the weaker states and make special effort to organize the unorganized states, among which many of the southern states are included."

DEL. LEE: The committee recommends that this be the sense of the congress, and so moves.

The motion was seconded, and carried, and the resolution adopted.

The following resolution was read:

FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

"Whereas, The foreign speaking organizations are under the burden of special expense for their special propaganda; and

"Whereas, It is particularly desirable that the foreign speaking population of these states shall become an integral part of the political action of the Socialist Party in America; and

"Whereas, The state is the unit of political action in the United States; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this congress recommend strongly to all respective state organizations that they grant charters to locals and branches of foreign speaking organizations, on conditions which shall return to the latter fifty per cent of the state and local dues; and be it further

"Resolved, That our foreign speaking comrades are reminded that the Socialist Party of America exists for the purpose of furnishing a political weapon to the working class of America; and that they are therefore under the necessity, as Socialists, of joining and co-operating with their state and local organizations."

FOREIGN SPEAKING BRANCHES.

"Resolved, That all foreign speaking organizations be permitted to organize branches whenever and wherever they can do so within the limits of the constitution of the Socialist Party, and that the secretaries of the respective states and the locals be called upon to act according to the will and the spirit of this resolution."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

DEL. LEE: The next resolution was introduced by Del. Frank Aaltonen of Michigan:

"Resolved, That we, the Congress of the Socialist Party, request the Executive Committee of the Socialist Party and also the Executive Committee of Local Cook County together to take into their consideration the possibility of building a labor temple in the City of Chicago for the use of American Socialists."

DEL. LEE: I will say that I understand that the Finnish organization own certain land in the City of Chicago, and that they considered that it might be advisable to build such a labor temple. Now, understand, this does not even commit the congress in any general way in favor of a certain plan, but simply asks the Executive Committee to consider whether it is feasible. In that sense the committee moves that it be adopted.

The motion was seconded. Delegate Cassidy of New York moved to lay the resolution on the table, but the motion was lost.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I have very great doubt as to whether it would be wise for this convention or congress to adopt that. The scheme is to secure the money by selling stock. Possibly after the stock has been sold, then they will sell bonds. There has been so much of that kind of thing. So far as I am concerned I am sick of it, and I am going to do what I can to expose it, and I think it is a dangerous thing, until the comrades know to what extent this matter has gone through the party, to inaugurate it by this resolution. If our foreign comrades can get their building up down in Pullman, in the neighborhood where I live, where the people know what is being done, well and good. But to work the whole party until it is endorsed by our local organization here, I think it is dangerous, and it ought not to be passed through this congress, because it will be used—

DEL. THOMPSON: I do not always agree with Comrade Morgan, but in this case I agree.

DEL. MORGAN: Oh, you will all come my way after awhile.

DEL. AALTONEN: The reason we moved this resolution to this congress was, that the Finnish comrades in the City of Chicago have somewhere about 150 or 200 members. A while ago they bought a lot here, and they are going to build a hall or temple in this town. Now, what is the use of dividing the movement all the while? What is the use of having a Finnish building on one corner and a Polish or Italian or English on another? Why not all get together and build one temple for this town? (Applause.) Why not build a temple which will have a hall for all the So-

cialists in the United States, regardless of their nationality? We have many little locals all over this country that have halls worth twenty, thirty, forty or fifty thousand dollars. Why can't we do the same thing that they can? There are something like 50,000 Socialists, I understand. If they were to take \$10 apiece that would bring half a million dollars. That is not so hard. In the town where I come from we are going to build a \$20,000 hall. We have something about eighty members in the local. Each member of the party gives at least \$50 or more, some as high as \$100, into the present building. Therefore, if the Finnish find it very good, the English comrades in this city should take some steps in that way so that the American Socialists here will have their own hall some time in the future. They don't want to build it now, but they do in the future. That is the reason I introduced this resolution.

On motion the resolution was then adopted.

NOMINATION OF IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: To save time, and with the consent of the congress, the chair will appoint a nominating committee to nominate the Committee on Immigration. Is there any objection to that procedure?

No objection was heard.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I move that the nominating committee be instructed to bring in at least seven names.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: I move to make it fourteen names.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you accept the amendment, Del. Simons?

DEL. SIMONS: I will accept it. The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will appoint as the nominating committee Delegates Simons, Aaltonen and Thomas.

Delegate Lee of the Resolutions Committee stated that two communications had been received from Local Honolulu and local union number 306, Carpenters and Joiners' Brotherhood, New York, and moved that the Secretary be authorized to send suitable letters of response.

The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the house concerning resolutions unfavorably reported was that they were not to be read, but were to be published in full in the minutes of the congress. Are there any others?

DEL. LEE: There are no resolutions reported favorably. All the others are reported unfavorably or were not within our province to deal with, and those were sent to other committees.

The following resolution of thanks was submitted and read, and on motion was adopted.

"Resolved, That the National Congress expresses its appreciation of the services rendered to it by its Secretary and assistant secretaries, its stenographers, the reading clerk, the National Secretary and his assistants, who have labored long and hard to aid and facilitate its work."

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Before the chairman of the Committee on Resolutions leaves the platform I want to ask him if among these resolutions that were acted upon unfavorably, are there any the publishing of which would cause controversy?

DEL. LEE: Yes, I suppose there are. DEL. GOEBEL: I would like to hear the titles of the resolutions read, in that event. I do not want to start a controversy, but I do not want anything in the minutes that would reflect on any official or anybody else connected with this movement, without it being heard right here.

DEL. MORGAN: If the titles are read and they cause discussion, then I shall ask that the entire resolution be read and let us know the entire wording.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I think that Comrade Goebel's point is well taken. I should not want any one to make charges that anything had not been properly presented, and I think the titles could be gone over quickly.

DEL. LEE: I can assure you that there are three or four which would probably involve some discussion, and possibly recrimination. There is one by Comrade Morgan of Illinois, dealing with the question of party papers and a demand for semi-annual financial reports from such papers. There is one from Comrade Morgan of Illinois about the exact sense of which the committee itself was not altogether clear, but which upon some interpretation it was thought might be conten-

tions, and in any case it was reported unfavorably, with regard to any compromise or alliance of party members or party organizations that do not proclaim a demand for the abolition of the economic relation of master and servant as the fundamental demand of every organization, etc. There is one by Comrade Reynolds of Indiana, reciting a number of whereases and providing for the inauguration of a special propaganda in the army and navy. There is one by Delegates Furman and Passage of New York, introduced at the request of Kings County Local, proposing to censure the National Executive Committee for its alleged neglect in the matter of the Spokane free speech fight. And there is, I think, one further.

DEL. MORGAN: There is another from Morgan, you will find.

DEL. LEE: Yes, that is what I was looking for, one of your resolutions that was contentious. There is another by Comrade Morgan of Illinois dealing with the question of the Wilshire gold mining stock scheme.

DEL. MORGAN: Pardon me. Going a little further and recalling the action of the National Executive Committee three years ago. I want it repudiated.

DEL. LEE: Referring to the action of the Executive Committee three years ago with reference to that same matter. Those, I believe, are the only unfavorably reported resolutions which would be contentious.

DEL. MERRICK: I presented a matter on Monday afternoon to the committee, and I would simply like to know if it is going to be printed, in regard to the use of the police. It was not read.

DEL. LEE: That was one of them, and I did not read it because it was regarded as contentious.

DEL. MERRICK: Is it among the resolutions?

DEL. LEE: It is, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion made with reference to these which are acknowledged to be contentious resolutions?

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: I move that they go to print.

Motion seconded and carried.

DEL. LEE: That completes the report of the Committee on Resolutions.

The following were the resolutions reported unfavorably, but ordered printed in the proceedings:

Resolved, That this Congress recommend that Socialist plate matter be prepared and supplied free to local papers willing to publish the same, and urge state organizations and comrades everywhere to make earnest efforts to secure its introduction wherever possible.

Introduced by J. E. Nash, Minnesota. To the National Congress:

Whereas, Certain Socialist papers are supported by the official endorsement of the party and are thereby able to sell their stocks and bonds and obtain subscriptions, loans and donations from party members; and

Whereas, This official connection renders the party morally responsible for the safety of several hundred thousand dollars obtained by these papers from comrades in the sale of stocks, bonds, loans and donations; therefore,

Resolved, That it is the duty of each of these papers to furnish the party with semi-annual statements of their financial and business condition prepared by independent professional accountants and the same be published as standing matter in each of such papers so all comrades may know the facts and act upon them.

(Signed) THOMAS J. MORGAN,
Delegate Illinois.

RESOLUTION.

Whereas, The Socialist movement is absolutely separated from all other movements by its fundamental demand for the abolition of the economic relation of master and servant, which, with its wage-system and competitive struggle for work, equals in inhumanity the preceding systems of slavery and serfdom; and

Whereas, the Socialist Party is a product of the Socialist movement and by the fundamental demand for the abolition of the economic relation of master and servant is absolutely separated from all other parties and organizations which do not make this demand their fundamental declaration and purpose; and

Whereas, the desire for immediate success as measured in its increased membership, increased vote and election of its candidates, tends to obscure this fundamental, a tendency encouraged by reactionary elements, both within and without the organization which presents and advocates more popular demands; therefore,

Resolved, That this congress, recognizing this demand for the abolition of the economic relation of master and servant as the fundamental demand of the Socialist movement and its creation of the Socialist Party as a political means of enforcing this demand, therefore, this congress declares that any compromise or alliance of party members or party organizations that do not proclaim this fundamental demand as their aim and object will be held to be a violation of party principles, and that the subordination of this demand to more popular opportunistic objects is more insidious and dangerous to the party than any open compromise or alliance can be.

(Signed) THOMAS J. MORGAN,
Delegate Illinois.

Whereas, Capitalism keeps the working class in subjection through force and through fraud; and

Whereas, With the spread of Socialist philosophy and revolutionary ideals which are rapidly permeating the American people, it becomes and will become increasingly difficult to deceive the masses, or to practice frauds successfully at the polls; and

Whereas, Capitalism is already turning to its last weapon and mainstay to check the rising revolutionary tide, namely, violent suppression by the army and militia; and

Whereas, It has been made exceptionally difficult to weaken the strong right arm of plutocracy by impregnating the army and the militia with Socialism; therefore, be it

Resolved, That we recognize the tremendous importance and the present necessity of making the rank and file of the army and militia conscious of their relationship to the people whom they are pledged to defend, and whose rights they are to guard.

Resolved, That we hereby authorize and direct our National Executive Committee to take action for the focusing and concentrating of specialized determined educational propaganda for Socialism by literature, correspondence and other educational methods among the privates of the army and navy over the entire country and its colonies.

Fraternally submitted,
S. M. REYNOLDS, Indiana.

Resolved, That the delegates present censure the National Executive Committee for their neglect to give support to the free speech fight in Spo-

kane, and we demand that on similar occasions in the future they shall unequivocally give their support to all movements of the working class for the right of free speech, free assemblage and a free press.

By instructions of Local Kings County, New York.

C. L. FURMAN,
W. W. PASSAGE,
Delegates.

RESOLUTION.

Whereas, The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party at its meeting March, 1907, in response to a protest of Local St. Louis against Wilshire stock gambling game in the Socialist Party, declared it reprehensible and detrimental to the interests of the Socialist movement to use Socialist publications for the promotion of such "enterprises;" and

Whereas, Since this official condemnation three years ago, the stock gambling game in the party has increased to such an extent as to demand action by which the party may be purged of all the corruption inseparable from this most despicable of all capitalistic schemes; therefore,

Resolved, That this congress recommend that the National Committee be requested to exclude from the Official List of Socialist papers all publications published by persons engaged in selling stocks and bonds in mining, oil and all other speculative enterprises; that every national officer and representative engaged or participating in such publications and such speculative enterprises be removed from all official and representative positions, and their names can no longer be used to lure comrades to financial ruin; that the state organizations be requested to take the same action in the election of local and state officials and representatives.

(Signed) T. J. MORGAN.

RESOLUTION.

Resolved, That the time has arrived when all Socialists and their friends should grasp from capitalism the furthestmost farthing obtainable for the building up of their own cause, and that is the voice of the present conference of the Socialist Party; that the National Committee should at once issue for the use of Socialists and their friends red trading cards representing

\$10.00, \$20.00 or \$25.00 of trade. That everywhere there are Socialists that they be requested to use these cards by calling upon their merchants and asking what percentage they will allow off for cash trade; that such merchants as will allow a discount be required to buy a punch to punch out the figures on the card representing the cash paid to said merchants by their Socialist customers. That said cards always be kept in stock by the Secretary of the Local.

That one-fourth of the amount received through the use of these cards go to the National Committee.

That one-half of the amount received through the discounts obtained through the use of these cards go to the Local selling them.

That in unorganized states one-half received from use of these cards go to National Committee and one-half to the Local selling them.

(Signed) S. W. ROSE.

Whereas, That quondam friend of the laboring class, William R. Hearst, who is either directly or indirectly interested in the Homestake mines of South Dakota, where union labor has been locked out for the past six months, for no other reason than that these men of labor refused to surrender their ethical, moral and industrial right to belong to the economic organization of their class for the purpose of protecting and advancing their personal, family and class interests, to which during election and campaign times the aforesaid Wm. R. Hearst ostensibly is very friendly; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Socialist Party of America in convention assembled endorse the resolutions of protest against the Homestake Mining Company which have been adopted by the various labor unions and approve of the boycott laid upon the Hearst publications by these organizations, and advise the workers of America to cease their support of these papers while the owners occupy such a position of antagonism to the interests of labor.

JOS. D. CANNON,
S. M. REYNOLDS,
ADOLPH GERMER,
W. B. KILLINGBECK,
E. L. CANNON, Oregon.

RESOLUTION ON "WORK FOR ALL."

The Socialist Party proclaims that among the duties of government is provision to employ all willing workers displaced by economic development and surplus values in the capitalistic system. And as a financial means to that end we stand for "centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly."

We further declare that the constitutional requirements for carrying out such propositions are embodied in Article 1, section 8, of the United States Constitution, which reads that congress "shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." Given ample power the Socialist Party will secure for such willing workers opportunities to earn an honest living.

(Signed) FRED HURST.

Whereas, This country is no longer a republic, but a capitalistic oligarchy.

Whereas, Capitalistic oppression and exploitation are driving the people to revolt.

Whereas, The constitutional safeguards of free speech, assemblage, suffrage, nomination and election of officials have through intimidation, fraud, graft and corruption by capitalism been turned into most formidable weapons for the enslavement of the people.

Whereas, Therefore, under the present form of government there exists no hope of relief except through a violent revolution; therefore, be it

Resolved, By this National Congress of the Socialist Party of the United States that we appeal to the whole people on strength of the constitution, Declaration of Independence and bill of rights in the courts of the various states to join us in a mighty combined effort to overthrow capitalism and institute a new form of government which shall insure justice and equity for all.

ALEX GUSTAFSEN.

COMMITTEE ON LITERATURE.

Suggestion that the National Office conduct the Literature Bureau on a larger scale, printing or reprinting pamphlets and books and selling them to locals at cost.

Comment: At the present time the crying need of the country is for systematic distribution of literature.

The National Office has undertaken the work of supplying leaflets, but for the most part the printing of books and pamphlets is in the hands of private individuals, who are not in a position to furnish them at cost.

The National Office not being so situated should publish books and pamphlets and sell them at cost. The cheaper these things are sold the more there will be distributed. The element of profit should not militate against the distribution of Socialist literature.

There are many comrades who are willing to spend money for pamphlets to distribute free. Under present conditions they must pay about 5 cents each; if they were sold at cost they would not be more than about 1 cent each. If the locals could get a regular 5 cent pamphlet at 1 cent they could sell many of them at 5 cents, enabling them to give four times as many away free. This would place them in the position of being able to put a pamphlet in the hands of each person interested.

The Party Bulletin can be used as an advertising medium, for it reaches nearly all party members.

Along with this the National Office ought to keep the locals in touch with the literature bureau by sending a special weekly or monthly communication to all locals, telling them of methods of selling and distributing pamphlets, etc. This information could be gotten from the locals, who would be only too glad to tell of the methods they find meeting with success.

Suggested by George N. Cohen, 3085 Kensington Ave., Philadelphia, Pa., Literature Agent of Local Philadelphia.

Chicago, April 18, 1910.
To the Officers and Delegates, Socialist Congress:

Whereas, The Socialist Party of America has in its ranks some of the ablest writers on economic subjects in the world, among whom may be mentioned Charles Edward Russell, Victor L. Berger, Joseph Medill Patterson, Robert Hunter, Upton Sinclair and a host of others; and

Whereas, The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party spends every year large sums of money to maintain traveling lecturers and organizers with but indifferent results as compared to the cost; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Seventh Ward Branch of Cook County, That we re-

spectfully suggest to the conference of the Socialist Party to be held in this city in May, that some plan be adopted whereby the money now expended for traveling lectures shall hereafter be devoted to the employment of the above mentioned and other competent literary experts in preparing pamphlets on the various subjects of public importance, and that these be printed by the National Committee and furnished to the various locals for free distribution.

Yours for the Revolution,
SEVENTH WARD BRANCH,
J. E. McKenna, Chairman.
F. N. Moore, Secretary.

A bureau of statistics to publish monthly such statistics as may be used by the speakers and the authority of such statistics to be given; a permanent statistician to be employed for that purpose.

As per instructions of Local Kings County, New York.

C. L. FURMAN,
W. W. PASSAGE,
Delegates.

Resolution adopted by Watertown, Mass., Socialist Club, and endorsed by the Socialist Club of Lynn, Mass., and by the City Central Committee, Boston Socialist Party Clubs:

It is of paramount importance that the Socialist movement secure representation in the National Congress at the fall elections. In certain congressional districts Socialist strength has developed sufficiently to make a successful contest probable. In order to secure this result our movement should concentrate its efforts at these particular points. The election of Socialist representatives is the next step forward. A Socialist group in congress would electrify the working class to a consciousness of the power that lies dormant within it.

RESOLUTION.

Whereas, The Socialist Party recognizing trades unions to be advance guards in the passing of the inevitable Social revolution; and

Whereas, The Socialist Party constitutes the political wing within the great labor movement; be it, therefore,

Resolved, To stand shoulder to shoulder with the economically organized fellow workers in their ever-waging struggles against the belligerent

Manufacturers' Association and other typical foes to organized labor; and be it further

Resolved, To endorse a policy apt to in its efficiency and expediency secure to the workers under the least expenditure of pain and sacrifice, substantial gains, and with the object in view to legalize demands such as are common to all workers.

LOCAL QUEENS COUNTY,
New York,
H. Schefer, Delegate.

Whereas, the strike, though judicially and administratively shorn of much of its effectiveness, still remains the most potent weapon in the hands of the workers in the incessant industrial warfare between the workers and the capitalists; and

Whereas, Its effectiveness is almost invariably destroyed by the violent and anarchical use by the capitalist class of the overpowering machinery of the state in the form of a criminal constabulary evidenced by irresponsible police brutality directed toward the struggling workers; and

Whereas, The aim of the Socialist Party is fundamentally the capture of the entire powers of the state by the working class for the purpose of using such powers in behalf of the workers in their struggles for industrial betterment and ultimate emancipation; and

Whereas, it is most important that the position of the Socialist Party be known upon the vital question of the attitude to be assumed by its elected administrative officers of the state during the existence of a strike; therefore, be it

Resolved, That during the pendency of all strikes we pledge the elected Socialist administrative officers to use the full powers under their control:

First, to preserve order, prevent violence of all kinds, guaranteeing protection to the property involved by a thorough patrol of it inside and out; and, second, arresting of all strike breakers and private police during any strike, and the prohibition of any person going upon a job to work while a strike is pending between an employer and employees.

SUPREME COURT.

Whereas, The Supreme Court of the United States now exercises as a right the power, whether it possesses it or not,

to declare unconstitutional any law of congress and sometimes does so by a mere majority of one; and

Whereas, Everybody knows that no judge is infallible, that some judges are or may become corruptible, and we, therefore, deem it extremely dangerous to the rights and liberties of the people to permit the Supreme Court of the United States by a majority of one to declare any law of congress unconstitutional; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of Local St. Helena, California, of the Socialist Party, that we favor as an immediate political demand of the Socialist Party of the United States that the congress of the United States immediately deprive the Supreme Court of the United States of the power to pass upon the constitutionality of any act of congress.

That at least it deprive the Supreme Court of the United States of the power to declare any law of congress unconstitutional unless the same is so declared by at least two-thirds of the full bench.

Resolved, further, That the congress of the Socialist Party be requested to recommend to the state conventions that they make similar demands applicable to State Supreme Courts.

Resolved further, That we favor a political demand abolishing the franking privilege except on matter pertaining to strictly official business of the several cabinet departments.

F. T. WHEELER, Chairman,
D. WILMOT SMITH, Secretary.

LOCAL ST. HELENA, CAL.

Whereas, So far as we are advised, no flag has yet been officially proclaimed or adopted as the flag of Socialism, international or local; and

Whereas, In view of the numerical strength of international Socialism, we think it is time such flag was considered, adopted and proclaimed; and

Whereas, Since the Socialists of every country seem spontaneously to make use of the red flag in proclaiming themselves Socialists, we favor the adoption of the red flag as the flag that shall stand for international Socialism; and

Whereas, Since Socialism is a worldwide movement, we suggest that such flag have on it on both sides, in size proportionate to the various size of flags, a picture of the world with com-

rades clasping hands around it and the words: "Workers of the World, Unite," the same as on our party button; therefore,

Resolved, By the members of Local St. Helena, California, of the Socialist Party, that we favor the adoption by said congress of the red flag with a picture of the world thereon as above described and the words above quoted, as the flag that shall stand for international Socialism, subject to ratification by the next international congress.

Resolved, further, That this resolution be forwarded to National Secretary J. Mahlon Barnes to be by him handed to the California delegation to the congress or to the congress itself.

F. T. WHEELER, Chairman,
D. WILMOT SMITH, Secretary.

All the statesmen of the Republican and Democratic parties realize that the constitution is inadequate to the needs of the people and offer sops in the shape of amendments and laws which are declared by the (nine autocrats, viz.) Supreme Court, "Unconstitutional," therefore we, the Socialists in mass convention, declare that should the people give us their vote we will call a constitutional convention forthwith.

Submitted by BOULDER BRANCH,
T. W. Bader, Chairman.
J. E. Edwards, Financial Secretary.

Whereas, Internal dissension is, and has been, dividing the Socialist Party of America against itself, resulting in the demoralization of what purports to be the revolutionary organization of the proletariat on the political field in the United States; and

Whereas, The cause of this division amongst ourselves must be found in the adoption in the past of wrong tactical methods; and

Whereas, It is essential that the Socialist Party of America shall ground its form of organization, its policy and its tactics upon what experience and logic point to as necessary for carrying out the revolutionary purpose of the Socialist movement; and

Whereas, it behoves the rank and file—the workers themselves—to readjust the tactical policies of the party to the end that the goal of the movement shall be achieved; and

Whereas, That goal is the administration of industry by a democracy of the workers themselves;

Therefore, Columbia Local Socialist Party of America by unanimous vote declares that:

It is the consensus of opinion of its members that the question of first importance to the working class is, Who shall control the industries and how shall they be administered in the interest of those who do the actual labor of production and distribution? The evident answer is that the industrial plants and the land must be owned and controlled, and that administration must be by an industrial democracy of the working class. Here the question arises, How shall the workers achieve this ownership and control? fundamental question depends the solution of all other questions confronting society. Today the working class is legally deprived of the right to say as to when or where they may perform productive or socially useful labor, what their wages shall be or what disposition is made of the product of their toil. These things are left solely to the class that owns industries and land, and this class makes laws in its exclusive interest through the functioning of the political state.

The ever increasing army of the unemployed proletariat makes more and more precarious the opportunity for workers to employ their own labor power for a wage, and through the action of the state there exists an absolute and tyrannical despotism in the management of industry.

We, the members of Columbia Local, Socialist Party of America, are persuaded that it is, therefore, of more importance to the working class to have the right to vote regarding the management of industry than to vote for political office holders, whether such be Democrats, Republicans or Socialists.

We perceive that the political office holder as an office holder has no power to make laws that shall justly determine when the wheels of industry shall turn, when the workers shall labor, what our wages shall be, or to exercise any control whatsoever over questions that concern labor.

We therefore conclude that, in order to enable the working class to achieve its industrial, therefore social liberty, the very form of governmental administration must be changed from government administered by representatives elected from a geographical locality to a form of administration in

AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 21, 1910

which representation is from the industries and departments of industries.

The conflicting interests between the owning class can be of no concern to the workers whose interests are opposed to every phase of capitalism. To discuss franchises, taxation, child labor and eight hour days as political measures is a waste of time and energy on minor effects of one great cause—Capitalism; and the state is the conservator of Capitalism.

We believe that the Socialist Party of America must readjust itself to the conditions and cease considering questions of political expediency except in so far as it is possible to use political methods for the dissemination of our propaganda and to use political power as a weapon for the destruction of the political form of government.

We believe that the industrial organization of the proletariat is of far greater importance than the building up of the political party; and that in the building of a Socialist political party the goal of our efforts must be the capture of the power of government to the end that this power shall be transferred from the political state to the industrial organization, which shall thereafter administer affairs.

We, therefore, contend that it should be made a part of the fundamental law of the Socialist Party of America, and of its tactical policy, to educate the working class to the necessity of industrial organization to the end that the might of the industrially organized proletariat shall, at the proper time, enforce the will and right of the working class expressed by the ballot, and that the workers shall thereupon assume the function of administration of the world's affairs, industrially.

We conceive the structural form of the social democracy to be industrial and not political, and we believe that the Socialists should bend their energies rather towards organizing their forces on the lines of what Socialist society must be in its ultimate realization than to wasting so much energy in a struggle for political supremacy which at best spells nothing more than a readjustment of the methods of capitalism.

We, therefore, recommend that these questions be studied and be discussed in our local meetings, and in the papers published in the interest of Socialism, and in our next national meeting, and we desire that the expression of

the next general convention in its manifesto shall be made to conform more to the revolutionary idea and less to discussion of non-essentials.

Approved and adopted by unanimous vote of Local Columbia, Columbia, S. C., March 13, 1910, and ordered to be sent to the national secretary of the Socialist Party of America for dissemination in the Official Bulletin.

J. F. CREIGHTON,
Chairman Columbia Local.
W. N. LYNCH,
Secretary.

In conjunction with Comrade Hillquit's report on propaganda among the colleges, we propose that the National Committee offer the amount of \$1,000 to be divided into several graduated prizes for the five best theses on Gustavus Meyers' History of Great American Fortunes, not exceeding 2,500 words, the offer of such prizes to be advertised upon the bulletins of at least ten of the most prominent colleges in the United States at the beginning of the fall sessions of said colleges, and the prizes to be awarded on March 1, 1911, all manuscript to be in the hands of the National Committee on or before January 1, 1911.

By instruction of Local Kings County, New York.

C. L. FURMAN,
W. W. PASSAGE,
Delegates.

REPORT ON ORGANIZATION.

The following report was submitted by the committee appointed to report on the report of Delegate Work on the subject of organization:

"The committee to act upon the report submitted by Comrade Work on organization found that report to consist of two divisions: preamble and specific recommendations. The latter had already been submitted to the Constitution Committee. In the preamble they voted not to concur.

"The committee would recommend as follows:

"First. The election of a commission of five to prepare a plan of organization.

"Second. That this commission have upon it one woman and one foreign speaking member.

"Third. That this commission meet once between now and the convention of 1912.

"Fourth. That all expenses for this meeting of the commission be paid by the National Office.

"(Signed) VICTOR L. BERGER,
"MARGUERITE PREVEY,
"M. T. MAYNARD,
"ED. MOORE,
"G. F. FRAENCKEL."

It was moved and seconded to adopt the report of the committee.

Delegate Goebel moved to amend by referring the report to the National Executive Committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I just wanted to remind you that I have the right to close the discussion as the reporter on Organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe that the report of this committee and its work can hardly be considered as the final action in consideration of your report. That was acted upon the other day, and your report was disposed of by reference to a committee.

On motion of Del. Wilson of California, Del. Work was given ten minutes to speak on the questions involved in his report.

At the suggestion of National Secretary Barnes, in order to meet a demand for what might otherwise be called "suppressed information," it was moved and carried that Del. Work's report be printed in its regular place in the report of the Congress.

DEL. WORK: Comrade Chairman and Comrades: Comrade Barnes seems to be about the only delegate or person in the congress who sees that it is due to the congress itself, as well as to me, that that is done. Otherwise, it would simply leave the congress in a very disgraceful position if they did not do so, because it would be in the position of having opposed common decency and of having opposed the increasing of the physical and mental efficiency of the working class. At the time that the motion was made to suppress the report, you delegates did not expect to vote for it, nor to vote for anything like it, and you did not conclude to do so until two comrades of international reputation made bitter speeches against my report on Organization. I refer, of course, to Comrade Hunter and Comrade Spargo. I do not believe in personal malice being dragged into any of our proceedings, and I have no personal malice against anybody, either here or anywhere else; but I do think that you ought to know that

those two speeches were made against my report on Organization simply from the motive of personal revenge.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I want to enter a protest against such a statement as that, especially in the absence of the two comrades in question. I desire to have the protest entered.

DEL. WORK: You can enter your protest, and anybody else can enter his protest, if he desires to do so; but it is the truth just the same; and Comrade Hunter, before he went away, in a truly comradely manner, came and asked my forgiveness, so that he is out of the question. With Comrade Spargo, it is a little more deep-seated. At one time, some time ago, I publicly proved that he had made statements which were not true.

My report on Organization has been charged with not dealing with the subject. This is a charge that cannot be truthfully brought against me. I always stick to the subject, and to show that the report was entirely on the subject, I am going to read to you the titles of what it dealt with in order that you can see that I tell the truth. The report dealt with the following titles: Essentials of effective organization; problems of local organization; our party pledge; membership; national committeemen; official organ; manner of electing national officers; appointment and dismissal of party employes; organizers and lecturers; co-operation between the organization and the Socialist press; national conventions; national referendums; methods of dealing with unemployed members; controversies over state officers; temporary state secretaries; assistance for weak state organizations; account books for state and local organizations; officers of locals and branches; assessments; blank resignations; organization and propaganda among women; methods of nominating candidates; increasing the physical and mental efficiency of the working class in order to increase the efficiency of the organization. All those things were argued for in the part of the report which I read to you, and the rest of the report simply consisted of specific amendments to the national constitution covering those points. And, by the way, I want to tell you that this congress has already adopted a large part of my report on Organization. The report of the Woman's National Committee included one portion of my report on Organization bodily, and this

congress adopted it; and in the report of the Committee on Constitution which you considered nearly all day yesterday and part of today, there were thirteen amendments to the national constitution which were taken from this report on Organization of mine, and out of those thirteen amendments to the national constitution twelve were adopted by this congress yesterday. (Applause.) It seems that, although all of these things were covered in my report, there were a few people in the hall who did not hear anything but one word in that report, and that word was "booze fighting," and that was what brought on all the trouble.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: Leave it out next time, John.

DEL. WORK: I won't leave it out, but I will put it in stronger than I did the last time. I want to prove to you right now that I was only taking the same stand, though I did not even go as far, that the Socialist national convention took two years ago. I hold in my hand the proceedings of the national convention of the Socialist Party of 1908, and on page 90 of those proceedings I find that Comrade Spargo, who was chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, brought in the anti-intemperance resolution, and Comrade Spargo said this:

"DEL. SPARGO: The last resolution that is part of our report is on the question of alcoholism. The delegates of the convention may know that there is a very considerable sentiment in favor of the convention taking some attitude upon the question of prohibition of the liquor traffic. There has been submitted to the committee and your committee beg to report a resolution which, while not in line with the demand for prohibition of the liquor traffic, nor as stringent as the last resolution of the German party, is nevertheless important in that it is the first time that a Socialist Party convention has been asked to pass upon the question of alcoholism at all. I hope, therefore, that every delegate, and, for that matter, the visitors, will listen as carefully as possible, I will read as carefully as possible so that there may be no misunderstanding:

"We fully recognize the serious evils incident to the manufacture and sale for private profit of alcoholic and adulterated liquors. We hold that any excessive use of liquor by members of the working class is a serious obstacle to

the triumph of our class, since it impairs the vigor of the fighters in the political and economic struggle, and we urge the members of the working class to avoid any indulgence that might hinder the progress of the movement for their emancipation.

"On the other hand, we do not believe that the evils of alcoholism can be remedied by any extension of the police powers of the capitalist state. Alcoholism is a disease of which capitalism is the chief cause, and the remedy lies rather in doing away with the underfeeding, overwork and overworry which result from the wage system."

That is the position that the Socialist convention took upon that subject, and although you may think from the remarks you heard upon the floor of this congress that I had tried to get the congress to adopt prohibition or something of that sort, all that I said in my report was that the members who had these undesirable qualifications for membership ought to try to develop themselves out of those qualities, and I also recommended that at convenient seasons, not all the time, but at convenient seasons, we send out a lecturer to lecture on the subject of health and sanitation and other kindred subjects. That is as far as I went.

I want to read you something else. This book that I have in my mind, is "Socialists at Work," by Robert Hunter. On page 198 of this work I find the following:

"Probably the most interesting development in the care of the children is that of the forest school near Berlin. The German cities having generally provided school physicians, found a large percentage of the children of such delicate health that there was no likelihood of their growing into strong men and women. Bad food and insanitary homes, added to general tendencies, were producing a class of children who must in time become a burden upon the community. Merely as an experiment, a forest school was established, to which several hundred children were sent. They are fed; nurses and doctors attend them; their lessons are given as far as possible in the open air; and every effort is made to build up a strong physical constitution. It has proved an amazingly successful experiment, and after a year or two of attendance practically all of the delicate children return to the ordinary schools in robust health. The food, the doctors, the nurses and the medicine, as

well as the teaching, are supplied at the expense of the community. Other similar schools are now being established, and it is reasonable to hope that within a few years they will have spread all over Germany, with the result that there will be few weak and delicate children at the end of the school period. The Socialists of Lille have undertaken a somewhat similar experiment, and the municipal control of the milk supply, which is now becoming general, is having an excellent effect upon the babies.

"In line with these efforts to solve the problems of morals and health is the war upon alcoholism. It is one of the most important problems that now confront the Socialist party. Aside from the purely humanitarian motives which influence the Socialists to attack alcoholism, there is also a party motive. They fully realize that one of the greatest enemies to the propaganda of their ideas is drunkenness. In many of the European countries almost the only strength remaining to the old political parties among the working class is the support of the shiftless and drunken elements in the large towns and industrial centers. In Belgium the Socialists own a large number of club houses, or Houses of the People, all of which are based upon extensive cafes patronized solely by the working class. Regardless of the financial loss entailed, alcoholic drinks are no longer sold in many of these co-operatives, and the Belgium party is developing a definite political policy against the entire drink traffic. One of the most significant things that has recently happened in Europe is the resolution against alcoholism passed at the last German national conference. In Sweden and the northern countries the Socialists have used their influence to promote the Gothenburg system of controlling the drink traffic. A law prohibiting all traffic in drink was recently passed in Finland, although there is a doubt whether the existence of certain international fiscal treaties will not render it to a certain extent inoperative. The Fabians in London advocate the municipalization of the industry in order to abolish the private interest in the making of drunkards. In Switzerland the drink traffic has been nationalized. In Russia the state's monopoly of spirit retailing was established solely for fiscal purposes and not to decrease drunkenness. The problem is a new one for the Socialist movement, but nearly everywhere in Europe it is beginning with characteristic energy an active campaign

against the liquor traffic and using its tremendous moral power among the masses to combat alcoholism."

Now, all I wish to say in conclusion is that in my opinion the Socialist movement stands and must stand for the highest and the best there is in everything. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the committee, to which this organization report was referred, is now before us. A motion is made to adopt it. Are you ready for the question?

DEL GOEBEL (N. J.): I move as a substitute to refer it to the Executive Committee.

The motion to refer was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the absence of the Secretary there is a little uncertainty. The chair understands that the committee of this congress on the subject of Government by Commission was made a permanent committee. Is that the sense of the congress, Comrade Thompson?

DEL THOMPSON: Yes, that is the way I understand the action.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to that? It is so ordered. I hold in my hand a resolution given to me, which I will read:

"Resolved, That this congress does not recognize as a Socialist any one who is not a steady subscriber to a Socialist paper."

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a little bit drastic, but a wholesome proposition.

No action was taken on the resolution.

The Chairman read the following resolution:

"Whereas, The financial assistance of the membership in the United States was a great help to the comrades in Milwaukee, whose victory is a victory for the Socialist movement in the United States; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the National Secretary ascertain the close congressional districts in the United States, and that the membership assist financially and by sending all national speakers available in such districts to elect national representatives at the earliest possible moment."

On motion of Delegate Goebel the resolution was referred to the Executive Committee.

IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE.

The report of the Nominating Committee on Immigration Committee was

read, submitting the following fourteen candidates for the vote of the congress: London, Untermann, Maynard, Wilson, Leo Laukki, Clyde J. Wright, Wanhope, Hillquit, Hunter, T. J. Lewis, Cohen, Gaylord, Valimaki, Prevey.

At the suggestion of Delegate A. M. Lewis of Illinois, the name of Delegate Spargo was added to the list.

On motion of Delegate Streb, the minutes of last Thursday were approved as published, subject to such correction in the roll call as may be necessary.

The vote was then taken on the Immigration Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: While we are counting the votes, Comrade Cory of Washington will speak.

DEL CORY: I think it might be well for you to know that out where I live on the Pacific Coast, one county, with something like 970 presidential votes, has started building a hall, and Skagit County, with 862 presidential votes, is building a hall, and we are now building a hall or Socialist Temple in the county where I come from. The comrades are active in this movement all over the state of Washington, and are coming to believe in the Socialists owning their own property, so that we do not have to go to the capitalist class to rent halls any longer.

On motion of Del. McDermott the

thanks of the congress were extended to the local delegates and local committee and resident comrades, for the excellent manner in which the work has been done.

On motion of Delegate DeBell the minutes of the congress as a whole were approved.

On motion the publication and editing of the proceedings of this congress were referred to the National Executive Committee; the debates, papers and essential proceedings to be in full, and unnecessary points of order or unessential matters to be omitted.

The report of the tellers on the vote on the Immigration Committee was made. The vote was as follows, the first seven constituting the committee: Untermann, 38; London, 32; Laukki, 31; Wanhope, 29; Wilson, 28; Spargo, 28; Hunter, 27. The following failed of election: Valimaki, 26; T. J. Lewis, 25; Prevey, 24; Gaylord, 24; Cohen, 23; Hillquit, 21; Maynard, 12; Wright, 9.

The members of the congress then, under the leadership of Delegate Streb, sang the "Red Flag" and the "Marseillaise," and after a standing silent tribute to the memory of the late Comrades M. W. Wilkins and Ben Hanford, and with three cheers for Socialism and three cheers for Milwaukee, the congress, at 4:54 p. m., adjourned sine die.

INDEX

A

Aaltonen, Frank—17, 167, 168, 239, 246, 264, 288, 289, 307, 308.
 Adams, Wm.—4, 17, 59, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Adel, E. E.—4, 167, 168, 235, 236, 239, 243, 246, 288, 289.
 Allen, C. C.—3, 22, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Ameringer, Oscar—4, 16, 22, 127, 136, 167, 168, 220, 221, 223, 225, 227, 233, 235, 236, 239, 246, 256, 288, 289.
 Atwood, E. Francis—4, 10, 13, 14, 80, 124, 167, 168, 197, 235, 236, 239, 246, 288, 289.

B

Barnes, J. Mahlon—3, 4, 5, 7, 16, 17, 23, 36, 37, 59, 93, 168, 251, 252, 267, 268, 301, 302, 316.
 Barnes, J. W.—3, 167, 168, 239, 246, 280, 288, 289, 306.
 Bassett, Arthur—4, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Behrens, E. T.—3, 83, 102, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Bell, W. J.—4, 5, 11, 12, 22, 37, 167, 168, 227, 239, 246, 249, 250, 255, 288, 289.
 Berger, Victor L.—4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 22, 25, 26, 34, 56, 58, 59, 60, 73, 74, 77, 92, 93, 118, 120, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 132, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 149, 167, 168, 169, 170, 174, 175, 176, 177, 188, 189, 191, 208, 209, 211, 229, 230, 236, 237, 239, 242, 243, 245, 246, 248, 249, 251, 252, 253, 256, 262, 268, 272, 273, 276, 287, 288, 289, 312, 316.
 Bloor, Ella Reeve—3, 17, 22, 37, 167, 168, 181, 183, 184, 189, 196, 197, 211, 237, 239, 246, 258, 260, 288, 289.
 Branstetter, Winnie E.—4, 11, 12, 58, 59, 72, 75, 136, 167, 168, 181, 182, 184, 194, 207, 211, 220, 239, 246, 257, 258, 288, 289, 293.
 Brewer, George D.—3, 123, 136, 167, 168, 234, 238, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Brown, W. Thurston—4, 22, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Buchanan, W. W.—4, 167, 168, 288, 289.

Burke, John P.—4, 167, 168, 169, 221, 239, 246, 282, 288, 289.
 Burton, W. H.—4, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.

C

California Delegation—4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 22.
 Cannon, E. L.—4, 22, 124, 126, 133, 167, 168, 233, 239, 246, 277, 278, 288, 289, 311.
 Cannon, Jos. D.—3, 51, 58, 124, 167, 168, 199, 200, 237, 239, 241, 246, 287, 288, 311.
 Carey, James F.—3, 14, 20, 21, 22, 38, 58, 136, 167, 168, 205, 206, 209, 239, 246, 268, 273, 287, 288, 289.
 Carpenter, W.—3, 22, 37, 167, 168, 235, 236, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Cassidy, Frank—4, 81, 118, 126, 167, 168, 182, 239, 246, 278, 279, 285, 288, 289, 307.
 Christensen, S. J.—4.

Cohen, Joseph E.—17, 22, 37, 74, 167, 168, 204, 209, 239, 242, 246, 249, 277, 279, 288, 289, 319.
 Collins W. P.—3, 21, 22, 37, 56, 59, 60, 61, 75, 128, 167, 168, 182, 221, 239, 246, 254, 260, 288, 289.
 Coonrod, T. J.—3, 22, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Committee on Commission Form of Government—
 Provision for—58.
 Nomination of—58.
 Election of—75, 301.
 Report of—290.
 Supplemental Report of—293.

Committee on Constitution—
 Provision for—7, 11.
 Nomination of—22.
 Election of—37.
 Report of—237-277.
 Supplemental Report of—259.
 Minority Reports of—240, 270.
 Committee on Farmers' Program—
 Report of—211.
 Debate on—220-235.
 Committee on Contested Seats—
 Provision for—7, 9, 10.
 Nomination of—10.

Election of—10.
 Report of—22.
 Committee on Immigration—290, 295, 301, 308, 318, 319.
 Report of—75.
 Minority Report of—77.
 Substitute for Reports of—98.
 Amendment to Substitute—106.
 Debate on—80-167.
 Committee on Resolutions—
 Provision for—7, 11.
 Nomination of—22.
 Election of—22.
 Report of—277-289, 302.

Cory, Mrs. E. D.—4, 10, 121, 167, 168, 199, 239, 246, 273, 288, 289, 319.
 Cumbie, J. T.—4, 10, 22, 167, 168, 228, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Crider, Dan C.—235, 236, 239, 246.

D

Davis, G. W.—4, 167, 168, 236, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 De Bell, James A.—3, 10, 17, 22, 37, 74, 80, 92, 93, 117, 122, 167, 168, 169, 224, 235, 239, 245, 246, 248, 250, 256, 257, 260, 261, 264, 271, 288, 289, 293, 299, 300, 301, 302, 319.
 De Lara, L. Gutierrez—304.
 Dills, Park—4, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 D'Orsay, Harriet—3, 9, 10, 16, 22, 55, 58, 60, 167, 168, 194, 205, 239, 246, 288, 289.

E

Economoff, Dimitri—4.

F

Fackert, Max—4, 10, 167, 168, 204, 239, 246, 249, 262, 288, 289.
 Foreign Speaking Organizations—4, 5, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 36, 259, 307.
 Fraenckel, G. T.—3, 5, 10, 20, 56, 57, 58, 60, 101, 162, 167, 168, 174, 175, 182, 239, 243, 246, 248, 288, 289, 316.
 Furman, C. L.—4, 37, 58, 59, 74, 167, 168, 170, 223, 229, 239, 241, 246, 284, 285, 288, 289, 306, 309, 310, 312, 315.

G

Garver, W. L.—3, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Gaylord, W. R.—4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 22, 37, 49, 55, 58, 59, 74, 131, 132, 160, 162, 167, 168, 234, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 263, 265, 266, 267, 270, 274, 288, 289, 306, 319.
 Germer, Adolph—3, 22, 133, 142, 167, 168, 277, 311.

INDEX

Giese, Robert—3, 167, 168, 288, 289.
 Goebel, Geo. H.—4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 22, 23, 37, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 73, 74, 80, 92, 114, 118, 167, 168, 175, 176, 177, 182, 198, 201, 202, 236, 248, 250, 254, 260, 262, 270, 275, 277, 288, 289, 300, 302, 308, 316, 318.

H

Haines, T. H.—4, 135, 144, 167, 168, 174, 239, 246, 288, 289, 306.
 Hanford, Ben—319.
 Heckala, John—4, 22, 135, 167, 168, 239, 247, 288, 289.
 Hermanovitch, R.—16, 17.
 Hillquit, Morris—4, 5, 34, 38, 58, 60, 61, 71, 72, 73, 74, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108, 109, 114, 117, 120, 124, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 135, 137, 141, 142, 143, 145, 152, 154, 156, 157, 159, 162, 167, 168, 169, 172, 175, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 201, 203, 204, 209, 210, 239, 246, 256, 272, 288, 289, 315, 319.
 Hiltunen, Toivo—4.

Hochscheid, Paul—4, 167, 168, 239, 247, 288, 289.
 Holm, N. F.—4, 19, 93, 138.
 Hoogerhyde, J.—3, 10, 11, 51, 167, 168, 236, 239, 246, 277, 288, 289.
 Houston, Harold W.—4, 58, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.

Hubschmitt, Frank—4, 17, 18, 139, 167, 168, 174, 239, 246, 261, 288, 289, 301.
 Hunter, Robert—15, 17, 34, 54, 58, 59, 114, 119, 125, 126, 133, 153, 160, 161, 233, 234, 235, 236, 246, 272, 287, 312, 316, 317, 319.
 Hurst, Fred—4, 73, 167, 168, 239, 246, 266, 267, 288, 289, 311.

Hutchisson, C. G.—3, 59, 75, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288.

I

International Secretaries—11, 12, 26, 49, 174, 259.
 Reports of—170, 172.

J

Jacobsen, J. J.—3, 11, 58, 59, 75, 83, 167, 168, 170, 174, 239, 246, 273, 288, 289, 290, 293, 299.

Judges—18.

K

Kaplan, Morris—3, 4, 9, 17, 112, 133, 164, 167, 168, 221, 239, 246, 248, 288, 289.
 Kennedy, Thomas F.—4, 10, 60, 93, 122, 123, 167, 168, 236, 237, 239, 246, 253, 288, 289.

Killingbeck, W. B.—4, 17, 22, 121, 139, 167, 168, 236, 238, 239, 240, 246, 251, 252, 254, 277, 288, 289, 311.

Kirkland, C. E.—301.

Klawâ, John—4.

Klawier, I.—4, 17, 18, 152, 183.

Kochanowicz, J.—4, 284.

Kokos, Casimir—156.

Kummerfeld, Henry—3, 22, 37, 167, 168, 225, 239, 246, 288, 289.

L

Lane, C. B.—167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.

Landersiek, Walter—3, 22, 167, 168, 239, 246, 249, 288, 289, 306.

Laukki, Leo—3, 19, 167, 168, 235, 236, 239, 246, 261, 288, 289, 319.

Laukki, Mrs. Esther—19, 140, 167, 168, 186, 187, 207, 211, 220, 239, 246, 288, 289.

Lee, Algernon—4, 10, 11, 13, 17, 22, 73, 106, 114, 117, 124, 126, 127, 142, 156, 157, 158, 159, 162, 167, 168, 169, 212, 216, 219, 239, 246, 248, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 269, 277, 285, 288, 289, 302, 303, 304, 306, 307, 308, 309, 316.

Lewis, A. M.—3, 10, 22, 57, 58, 60, 136, 167, 168, 226, 227, 228, 231, 235, 236, 239, 246, 288, 289, 301, 304, 306, 308, 309, 317, 319.

Lewis, Lena Morrow—15, 28, 136, 191, 208, 211, 220.

Lewis, Tom J.—4, 5, 17, 22, 37, 58, 60, 141, 145, 152, 162, 165, 167, 168, 224, 226, 231, 235, 239, 246, 288, 289, 290, 319.

London, Meyer—4, 17, 18, 19, 127, 160, 163, 295, 319.

Lowe, Caroline A.—3, 22, 37, 167, 168, 181, 186, 187, 211, 220, 239, 246, 260, 270, 271, 273, 274, 288, 289.

M

Malkiel, Theresa—181, 182, 184, 185, 187, 193, 202, 205, 207, 211, 220.

Maurer, James H.—13, 17, 167, 168, 175, 176, 235, 236, 239, 244, 246, 278, 282, 288, 289.

Maynard, Mila Tupper—3, 15, 22, 58, 60, 108, 114, 152, 161, 167, 168, 179, 184, 196, 199, 200, 205, 207, 211, 220, 239, 246, 258, 288, 289, 316, 319.

McAllister, W. W.—3, 7, 10, 105, 119, 133, 167, 168, 239, 242, 246, 281, 288, 289.

McDermott, Geo. W.—3, 50, 74, 110, 151, 167, 168, 211, 239, 246, 288, 289, 300, 319.

McLevy, Jasper—3, 22, 58, 59, 75, 167, 168, 239, 246, 255, 277, 288, 289, 293.

Merrick, Fred H.—26, 58, 92, 103, 104,

106, 123, 167, 168, 197, 205, 233, 239, 246, 249, 250, 256, 275, 288, 289, 298, 301, 306, 308, 309.

Miller, W. H.—4, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.

Montefiore, Dora B.—5, 6, 136.

Moore, Ed—17, 22, 37, 49, 50, 58, 60, 167, 168, 239, 241, 246, 248, 249, 256, 288, 289, 316.

Morgan, T. J.—3, 8, 10, 15, 22, 37, 54, 100, 104, 120, 127, 142, 143, 145, 157, 167, 168, 198, 201, 202, 223, 226, 227, 230, 231, 238, 239, 243, 246, 257, 277, 288, 289, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 302, 307, 308, 310.

Morton, Rufus J.—4, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289, 306.

N

Nash, J. E.—3, 35, 136, 167, 168, 239, 246, 265, 266, 267, 288, 289, 309.

Nelson, A. W.—3, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.

New Castle Situation—236.

Novak, Joseph—4, 262.

O

O'Hare, Kate Richards—3, 58, 60, 73, 100, 167, 168, 182, 185, 186, 189, 232, 233, 235, 236, 239, 246, 288, 289, 302.

Oneal, James—3, 9, 18, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.

O'Neil, W. L.—4, 14, 49, 51, 60, 150, 167, 168, 169, 239, 247, 275, 276, 288, 289.

Osborne, J. B.—3, 22, 59, 75, 167, 168, 181, 239, 246, 288, 289.

P

Passage, W. W.—4, 18, 144, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289, 306, 309, 310, 312, 315.

Pellegrine, James C.—4.

Pekos, Rokos—4.

Permanent Secretary—17.

Peterson, G. A.—3, 17, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.

Prevey, Marguerite—4, 5, 6, 10, 57, 58, 60, 98, 167, 168, 169, 176, 187, 200, 211, 220, 239, 246, 283, 288, 289, 316, 319.

R

Reading Clerk—18.

Report of National Secretary—23.

Report on Organization—38.

Debate on—49-58.

Special Committee on—

Provision for—55, 58.

Nomination of—58.

Election of—60.

Report of—315.

Report on Propaganda—61.

Debate on—71-74.

Resolutions—

On Labor Organizations—277.

On Fred Warren—302.

On Free Press Fight—302.

On White Slave Traffic—302.

On Socialist Plate Matter—303.

On Literature Bureau—303.

On Workmen's Compensation—303.

On Industrial Training—303.

On Mexico—304.

On Finland—306.

On Congressional Program—306.

On Deportation and Abuse—306.

On Unorganized States—306.

On Foreign Speaking Organizations—307.

On Labor Temple—307.

Of Thanks—308.

Not adopted—309-315, 318.

Reynolds, S. M.—3, 22, 37, 167, 168, 239, 246, 260, 271, 273, 288, 289, 309, 310, 311.

Ringler, Robert B.—4, 14, 17, 167, 168, 239, 246, 255, 288, 289.

Roewer, Geo. E., Jr.—3, 5, 17, 38, 59, 83, 137, 167, 168, 196, 236, 239, 246, 270, 288, 289.

Roll Call—17, 22, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.

Rose, S. W.—4, 19, 22, 58, 59, 75, 93, 167, 168, 198, 239, 247, 288, 289, 293, 306, 311.

Royal, A. J.—58, 59, 75, 167, 168, 239, 247, 288, 289, 306.

Rules of Procedure—6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 175.

S

Schefer, H.—4, 167, 168, 246, 288, 289, 313.

Schnaider, E. L.—4, 54, 167, 168, 239, 246, 249, 252, 281, 288, 289.

Seidel, Emil—137, 156, 167, 168, 169, 230, 233, 239, 247, 285, 288, 289.

Sergeant-at-arms—17, 60.

Silver, Grace V.—3, 17, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.

Simons, A. M.—3, 9, 16, 22, 52, 53, 58, 167, 168, 174, 176, 181, 182, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 197, 211, 212, 220, 221, 223, 226, 230, 231, 232, 234, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 246, 249, 250, 251, 253, 256, 257, 266, 274, 288, 289, 297, 298, 300, 301, 303, 308.

Simons, May Wood—177, 181, 189, 200, 201, 202, 205, 209, 211, 220, 239, 247, 288, 289.

Skala, Steve—4, 265.

Slatton, E. B.—4, 167, 168, 239, 247, 288, 289, 306.

INDEX

Smith, J. Frank—4, 167, 168, 239, 247, 288, 289.

Socialist Press—31, 32, 33, 39, 45.

Socialist Vote—30, 31.

Spargo, John—15, 55, 60, 77, 80, 92, 93, 94, 98, 99, 100, 103, 117, 133, 142, 152, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 162, 164, 165, 166, 210, 316, 317, 319.

Strelbel, Gustave—4, 10, 17, 18, 38, 60, 75, 88, 93, 124, 136, 138, 143, 167, 168, 170, 182, 183, 208, 236, 239, 240, 246, 250, 288, 289, 295, 299, 319.

T

Telegrams and Communications—6, 59, 277, 308.

Tellers—17.

Temporary Secretary—5.

Thomas, E. H.—4, 5, 22, 211, 277, 282, 308.

Thompson, Carl D.—4, 9, 10, 38, 58, 75, 83, 136, 167, 168, 170, 221, 228, 232, 236, 239, 243, 246, 250, 251, 252, 274, 275, 276, 283, 285, 288, 293, 295, 298, 299, 300, 301, 307, 318.

U

Untermann, Ernest—3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 16, 22, 37, 38, 77, 80, 81, 83, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 113, 114, 122, 123, 126, 127, 130, 135, 139, 150, 152, 153, 156, 158, 159, 162, 164, 167, 168, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 239, 246, 281, 285, 286, 288, 289, 298, 300, 319.

V

Valimaki, John—17, 146, 261, 319.

W

Wanhope, Joseph—4, 22, 75, 77, 122, 126, 127, 142, 148, 154, 162, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289, 319.

Waynick, W. H.—4, 22, 147, 167, 168, 239, 246, 278, 286, 288, 289.

Wentworth, Marion Craig—167, 168, 189, 194, 205, 239, 246, 288, 289.

White, Dan A.—58, 106, 167, 168, 237, 239, 244, 246, 288, 289.

Wilde, John H.—3, 7, 22, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289, 295, 296.

Wilkins, M. W.—319.

Willert, John G.—4, 7, 8, 22, 167, 168, 196, 211, 239, 246, 261, 268, 277, 288, 289.

Wilson, J. Stitt—3, 8, 22, 37, 58, 59, 60, 154, 167, 168, 182, 206, 209, 210, 211, 239, 246, 260, 288, 289, 290, 293, 295, 296, 301, 316, 319.

Wolff, Barnett—4, 10, 14, 19, 129, 143.

INDEX

Woman's National Committee—42, 48, 53, 72, 211, 258, 303, 316.
Report of—177.
Debate on—182-211.
Work, John M.—3, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 22, 26, 28, 37, 38, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 167, 168, 175, 176, 182, 210, 211, 239, 241, 246, 250, 260, 271, 288, 289, 315, 316, 317.
Wright, Clyde J.—3, 22, 26, 28, 167, 168, 221, 225, 226, 235, 236, 239, 246, 288, 289, 319.

Z

Zimmerman, P. G.—4, 167, 168, 239, 246, 289.
Zitt, L. A.—4, 15, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288